DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 154 EA 011 428

TITLE	Managing Your Schools: What's Ahead. Education U.S.A. Special Report.
INSTITUTION	National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	97p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National School Public Relations Association, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($9.95; all orders under $12 must be accompanied by payment)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Board of Education Policy; *Board of Education Role; Boards of Education; Case Studies; Management by Objectives; *Management Systems; Personnel Management; Records (Forms); School Community Relationship; School Organization
IDENTIFIERS	Management by Group Objectives; Zero Base Budgeting

ABSTRACT

Today's schools are faced with a new challenge--namely, how they can be managed more effectively. This book evaluates concrete management plans such as Management By Objectives (MBO) and Zero-Base Budgeting and explains the principles that different systems work on, where they have been tried, how they have succeeded or not succeeded, and why. Detailed case studies are cited and charts illustrate the methods discussed. The book also offers alternatives for simplifying and updating existing types of management. Individual chapters deal with administrator training and school district policies, management methods, management approaches, personnel management, school-community relations, and school organization. The appendix offers a sample teacher evaluation form and a model superintendent contract. The book is written for superintendents, administrators, and school board members. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168154

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Managing Your Schools:

What's Ahead

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NSPRA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EDUCATION U.S.A. Special Report

A PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION

EA 011 428

Copyright 1979
National School Public Relations Association
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Library of Congress Catalog No. 79-83736

Stock No. 411-13349. All orders under $12 must be accompanied by payment. All orders over $12 must be accompanied by payment unless submitted on an authorized purchase order from a school district, organization or institution. Billed orders will include shipping and handling charges. Address communications and make checks payable to National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

Table of Contents

Overview 5

Chapter 1. The 'Challenges' Change 12

Chapter 2. Establishing a Base: Training and Policies 17

Chapter 3. Management Methods 24

Chapter 4. Management Approaches 39

Chapter 5. Evaluation: An Essential Step 53

Chapter 6. Personnel 59

Chapter 7. School/Community Relations 63

Chapter 8. School Organization 72

Appendix

Sample Teacher Evaluation Form 80

Model Superintendent Contract 89

Acknowledgment

Managing Your Schools is one of a series of Education U.S.A. Special Reports on current trends in school policies and programs. The purpose of the series is to provide school practitioners at all levels, and others concerned with education, with the most up-to-date information on the issues at the core of today's constantly changing education scene.

Managing Your Schools was written by Robert Olds of Santa Barbara, Calif. It was developed and produced by the Education U.S.A. Special Reports staff: Anne C. Lewis, Executive Editor; Cynthia C. Menand, Director of Editorial Services; and John H. Wherry, Editorial Director. Special research, editorial and production services were provided by Janet Eaffy, Holly DiVenere, Mary Ann Johnson and Jenny McAllister; graphics services by Brooke Todd and Associates.

The National School Public Relations Association expresses its gratitude to the school districts, state departments of education, professional education associations and other education interest groups which responded to requests for information and offered valuable assistance to the researchers, writers and editors of this report.

Overview

After 14 years on the job, Paul W. Briggs, once the very durable superintendent of schools in Cleveland, Ohio, was able to tell jokes about himself and his associates. He had a favorite story he told to audiences of school administrators. It was called "The Wild Kingdom," and Briggs said that is the natural habitat of administrators. This kingdom, he said, offers no real refuge for an administrator. "The season for superintendents is open 12 months a year, 24 hours a day—and that's way too long." Superintendents, like deer, should have a "protected season" from sniping by the community. "I would prefer something much shorter," Briggs confided to his listeners, "say something like from Thanksgiving to Christmas. Besides people are much kinder then than at any other time of the year."

Briggs also described a vast "hall of administrators," which he envisioned could one day be established in a major metropolitan area. "High on the walls would be the mounted heads of school administrators who have fallen in battle," he said. "There will be guides to take the public through. With respect, they will point to the dates beneath the heads—1929-38, '38-'45, '45-'51—nothing that the respective years in office grow shorter as we reach the present."

In some cases, "the cause of failure or the moments of triumph will be given," smiled Briggs, "such as 'he escaped from ever using planning-programming-budgeting systems (PPBS) or management-by-objectives (MBO)'." Briggs' audiences would laugh with him. And many remembered his speech when they heard of Briggs' resignation after fiscal and desegregation problems plagued his school district. Some have escaped the "innovations" which involve adapting an "exotic" system of management planning to school use. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, great strides were made in planning by many industries. Some developments—especially in the highly publicized aerospace manufacturing and launch areas—were so spectacular and precise that others assumed wide adaptations would be possible using

these same tools and types of planning. Boards of education were easily persuaded to order computers for their school districts. Typically, these installations were placed under the jurisdiction of the assistant superintendent for business. After all, did not the "B" in PPBS mean "budgeting"?

The first computer installations anticipated many uses available to school districts in order to justify purchase of the computers—including scheduling classes, keeping records of individual student grades, maintaining an inventory of supplies, recording the number of student absences and other uses. But much of this activity resulted neither in fewer employes nor in lower costs nor in a reduction in the cost of space. In fact, many of the rooms that housed the computers had to be air-conditioned—a reality that was long taboo and that many school districts were reluctant to face.

In some states, government leaders decided that if a planning system was good enough for some industries and school systems, then it should be good enough for all school districts. California, for example, did not exactly mandate that all school districts should engage in PPBS. But it required all districts to make their financial reports to the state according to a PPBS format. An almost immediate response from one independent manufacturer was a "conversion kit," which enabled a school district to continue its conventional recordkeeping format and then use the kit to adapt to the PPBS format at the time of the report. Other statewide conversions of management practices, like the goals and objectives system, have been put into practice in piecemeal form unless they were adopted as the outcome of sweeping court mandates.

Similarity to Classroom Practices

These new educational management practices are remarkably similar to classroom teaching innovations which have been generally adopted around the country. Management-by-objectives (MBO) is similar to the individualized instruction approaches which involve teaching by goals and objectives. One Midwestern superintendent is amused that his elementary school teachers have easily been able to adapt to new teaching programs, while his administrators—on the other hand—have had difficulty in switching their thinking away from older management methods. Secondary school staff members are also finding some difficulties in relating to the new system, he says.

One of the unique features of the new national Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) is that each child being served is required to have an "individualized education plan" (IEP). Such a plan

includes all of the classic ingredients of MBO and PPBS—i.e., the annual goals statement, specific plans of services to be provided, short-term objectives, a stated basis for evaluation and whether or not the objectives are being met. Some educators are already speculating that if parents, teachers and school principals are to be under a legal mandate to plan and determine the instructional content and the means of evaluating the success and learning progress of a handicapped child, will such planning and involvement be denied to all other children and their parents? And other major developments—which only a decade ago were only remote possibilities for many school administrators—are now demanding immediate attention and time. These include the problems of declining enrollments, federal and state intervention in education, collective bargaining with teachers and, as usual, inflation. The traditional "just give us enough money" cry of the school administrator is being heard as clearly now as at any time in the past.

How Do You Do It?

The need for school boards and administrators to communicate these new problems facing school districts to their constituents has never been greater. Here are some sample questions now being asked of today's administrators:

- Why should school budgets be increased when enrollments are falling?
- What is being done to cut out curriculum "frills"?
- Why are teachers being recruited when schools are being closed due to the lack of pupils?
- How many teachers have been fired for incompetence during the past year?
- Can field trips really be substantiated?

Only a small fraction of the nation's schools operate planned and funded public information programs to keep taxpayers informed about education's progress and problems. Most current programs are oriented toward media campaigns that are outdated in terms of today's challenges. Some administrators have complained that the people who are closely associated with a school district's power center really do not

want a public which is "extremely well-informed." They say employe groups prefer that educational management be kept comparatively "quiet." School boards, they say, like to be regarded as being the best informed school group and do not look kindly upon sharing too much information with parents and the public in general. One of the wealthiest school districts in the country has a school board whose members have repeatedly rejected administration recommendations for a comprehensive community opinion poll. The board members have argued that as elected public officials they were chosen to act for the community, and that they do not need to depend upon opinion polls to guide their judgment.

Outside forces are dictating local school district responses and action on a scale previously unimagined. Virtually all public school districts have for the past 30 years been geared to a continuing pattern of growth and expansion. School management has become accustomed to think in terms of overcoming problems like shortages of personnel, space and instructional materials, and ever increasing financial requirements. The decline of the birthrate and the increase in family mobility have provided new and painful lessons to many school administrators. But sharply declining enrollments have not, in most districts, led to a general recognition of the fact that schools in the foreseeable future will operate in an entirely different environment.

"An increasing birthrate has a great deal of visibility associated with it," says one Midwestern superintendent. "But when things go the other way, there's not much to see." Coping with declining enrollment is in many ways more difficult than managing growth. And when you add sustained inflation to a declining enrollment situation, the outcome can offer little other than management headaches. "Inflation has truly become the economic disease of our society," said Los Angeles Supt. William J. Johnston sadly as he recently presented to his school board a budget totaling $1.2 billion, along with a lengthy list of proposed cuts in both programs and personnel. "It is a perennial ailment which eats at the heart of our enterprise."

More Than Money

School management problems are far more complex than just the need for more funds. Administrators always say they need more money. In this respect, they are not unlike managers in any other field—and especially in public management. In every field that is expanding, there has been until very recently the conviction that "more money" was the primary solution to shortages of all kinds. Generally speaking, the hiring

of teachers has only been a matter of dollars since the end of World War II. And although teacher recruitment posters have blatantly publicized nearby water recreation, sports and historical attractions and scenic views, the job's salary schedule and fringe benefits still receive primary consideration from prospective teachers. Thus, the ability to employ the "best" teachers has been equated in professional and lay people's minds for 40 years with an ability to pay the highest salaries. Numbers have frequently been used by educators to identify quality in a school: the numbers of library volumes per pupil, the dollar expenditures per pupil, average salaries, teacher/pupil ratio, number of graduates accepted in universities, the percentage of teachers with master's degrees and others. These measures—traditionally accepted by most educators and school boards—also appeared to satisfy the school's many publics.

The public demand for more tangible evidence of achievement in education has been attributed to rising costs and higher taxes, and this concern was inevitable. The symptoms that education had passed its peak were already apparent, however. Enrollments began to drop in some suburban districts; in big city schools, classrooms were empty where double-shift classes had previously been full.

Dissatisfaction with the overall quality of education in this country came to the surface after the Soviets launched the Sputnik I satellite in October 1957. Many politicians and others claimed there was a relationship between the Russian technological achievement and some real or imagined shortcomings on the part of elementary and secondary school students. Despite the questionable logic of the theory, it was given broad coverage in the media, and the schools became the targets of criticism over the shortcomings in space exploration. This triggered the intervention of the U.S. Congress, which has been appropriating larger and larger amounts of federal dollars ever since to improve education for all students in the country.

Because of all these forces, the business of operating a school district on the basis of formal goals and objectives—which have to be spelled out, widely understood and agreed upon in terms of specific results—could become one of the most revolutionary educational developments in this century.

The goals of education in a school district, when not subjected to the process of having to reach a formal community agreement, become the potential target of criticism from political and social forces outside the schools which are frequently in contention. In the face of public opposition, educational managers frequently collapse because their only defense against sweeping, generalized charges of failure is likely to be angry denials or undocumented rebuttals. There is even some uncertainty today about who or what is "management" in a school district.

Usually, school board members have the authority to make decisions that affect local school operation and are specifically authorized to do so by their state's legislative body. Some state legislatures, however, have reserved many educational decisions for themselves.

Managers Managing Managers

Richard W. Hostrop, author of *Managing Education for Results*, sees school boards and higher education trustees as the managers of their chief executives. These chief executives, in turn, manage administrators and others in the school operation. Hostrop is concerned about the simple definition that a manager is "in charge of other people and their work." Said Hostrop:

> The manager's relationship to his superiors and peers is as essential to his effective performance as are his relations and responsibilities to those who report to him.

The manager's first responsibility is "upward to his superior, to the enterprise whose instrument he is, to the system's goals and objectives," said Hostrop. "Increasingly, superior education managers can be distinguished by their acceptance of personal accountability for achieving measurable results."

The idea that a manager's chief task is to assist others to reach already set and agreed upon objectives as determined by measures selected in advance is foreign to many of the traditions in education. The main ingredient which has guided and controlled educators through the years has been time. Student advancement—and that of teachers, too—has been determined by "seat time" that is sliced into days, weeks, semesters, credit hours and degrees. The equating of assignments completed on time with success has been such an accepted "standard" that it has been used as one basis for pay increases and fringe benefits. A shift to success as measured by progress determined in advance by agreed-upon yardsticks is a departure from centuries of educational tradition. So is the concept that a manager's duties include a clear responsibility to help subordinates succeed.

Living with Conflict

The direction in which school administration appears to be headed is not comforting, and there will be no shortage of risk-taking for people in these positions. Larry Cuban, superintendent of the Arlington, Va.,

schools and author of *Urban Chiefs Under Fire*, a book which traces in detail the administrative ventures of recent superintendents in San Francisco, Chicago and Washington, D.C., schools, sees factors on the horizon that will influence the careers of school administrators during the years ahead. Effective leadership is going to involve an ability to live with conflict, Cuban says. He says it is encouraging that more administrators seem to be aware that they need to possess the skills of conflict resolution, and that there is a greater awareness of what he calls "the political dimensions of getting things done." He sees no reduction in "the vulnerability of being a superintendent" during the years ahead. "This is historic and structural and, in my judgment, will not change," Cuban observes.

On the other hand, there will be an increase in the number of politically astute administrators, but Cuban believes this will not have much impact on job turnover. Today, there is actually "bias against the notion of being politically sensitive (not in a partisan sense) in order to get issues resolved," he said. And the view ahead may also be quite different for school board members. "These are not happy times," observes Howard Thompson, a veteran board member from Prophetstown, Ill. "It used to be almost fun to serve on a school board," he says, "adding staff, adding programs, dealing with growing enrollments, everything growing and improving—a really positive attitude by everyone. Then came unionism, collective bargaining, inflation, declining enrollments, declining revenues and more demands by state and federal governments in the form of mandated programs, services and requests for information. Then, lawsuits and threats of litigation, impasses, fact finding, arbitration, cutting programs, cutting staff—all this means a good deal of unpleasantness for board members and a generally negative feeling by almost everyone. It's a time when the board and the administration really need to show responsible leadership. We need to give direction."

Chapter 1.

The 'Challenges' Change

The promise of the "baby boom" in the 1950s turned into a nightmare for education in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. It seemed only logical for the increasing birth rates of the 1940s to continue. There had been a shortage of classrooms and teachers since World War II. School boards were looking for sites for the new schools they assumed would be badly needed in the next 10 to 20 years. But their pride in making "great deals" on land for new schools soon turned to panic when it became apparent that the increased use of the birth control pill, along with changing social values in other areas, could mean they would not even fill the classrooms they already had.

What *Business Week* had called the "birth dearth" of the depression years—when the number of total births dropped to about 2.5 million yearly—shifted into a "baby boom" after World War II, which lasted until the early 1960s and raised the birth rate past the 4 million mark. Then came the "baby bust," and total births dropped once more, to 3.13 million. Most population experts were stumped. The decrease in the number of marriages, the rising divorce rate, expanded career opportunities for women, postponed childbearing plans, high housing costs, the high cost of rearing children—all are relatively new forces that seem to point to a different kind of America, one which no longer can depend on the "grow-grow-grow" traditions of the past in terms of continuing population growth, future generations of sizable families or unlimited numbers of immigrants coming into the country.

This trend produced many changes in the education system as well. Suddenly, there was a sharp drop in teacher recruiting activity. The skills and manpower usually lavished on school district recruiting operations slowed to a halt. Colleges and universities, however, continued to turn out large numbers of teachers and administrators as though the word about reversed manpower needs had never been circulated.

The enrollment decline came at a bad time for school management. It did not seem quite fair that the same administrators who had met the

challenges of the long years of booming enrollments with shortages of everything else should now be required to take on more—and very different—challenges. Suddenly, they were hit almost simultaneously from every direction with new kinds or problems—and most of these problems had never before been confronted by the public schools. Anyone who was unhappy with a school administrator or school board, it seemed, got a lawyer and filed a law suit. School boards, which previously had needed legal advice so infrequently that it was usually obtained from the district attorney's office when necessary, are now employing legal firms or adding staff lawyers to answer the legal actions that have been taken on behalf of students, parents, teachers and other school employes against school district officials for what they have done or failed to do.

The Ohio State Board of Education, for example, reviewed its position at one point and discovered it had 39 lawsuits pending against it in federal, state and local courts. And although the Fairfax County, Va., school board was making progress in defending that district in a legal action brought by a student in connection with the publication of a student newspaper, it stopped pursuing the case after learning the extent of the legal fees of the students involved.

A 'Litigation Explosion'

David W. Carroll, general counsel for the New Jersey School Boards Assn., calls the growing practice of people suing other people a "litigation explosion." He says that in 1960 only 280 legal actions were filed in the federal courts by private citizens in order to enforce their civil rights. In 1976, he says, the total rose to 10,585 actions. New Jersey's education commissioner, he said, publishes a volume called *School Law Decisions* each year. The 1959-60 edition contained written opinions in a total of 36 cases. By 1974, the usual single volume was no longer large enough to report the total number of cases for the year. Two volumes were necessary in order to report decisions in the more than 200 cases, and the two sections totaled more than 1,300 pages. Carroll commented: "No one is quite sure what causes lie behind the profusion of law suits. Demographic shifts can account for only a small percentage of this increase. Probably a much more significant factor is the passage of new legislation. New laws create new legal rights, and resort to the courts is often necessary to enforce those rights, particularly during the initial period following enactment."

There also has been a great deal of encouragement by federal agencies and many state officials to get people to seek remedial action

against laws and rulings thought to be unfair or improper. The government agencies, well-staffed with legal talent, have been quick to use legal means for getting state and local agency or citizen compliance with regulations or laws. Civil rights organizations and other advocacy groups have also sought court actions in support of or in opposition to government rulings.

Meanwhile, as teacher organizations have pursued collective bargaining, an entirely different arena has become crowded with legal talent. Some school boards and teacher groups have preferred to use lawyers as their active bargainers; in other instances, the bargainers are aided by advice on legal points and tactics that comes from legal counsel. In some states, it has become necessary to obtain help from labor attorneys, who are well-versed in the rules and decisions of the National Labor Relations Board. This legal area has become so broad for some school boards that they are no longer able to obtain sufficient legal services through such designated sources as the office of the county attorney. In many states, laws have been altered to permit the school boards to employ their own legal services.

Increased Governmental Pressures

Part of the demand for increased legal services in school districts comes from new pressures that were created initially by greatly enlarged federal and state staffs—not just in the administrative departments and commissions, but large staffs which have been created by the committees and subcommittees in Congress and by the committees in state legislatures. Staff assistants seeking favorable attention for committee leaders, or entire committees, continually look for subjects which lend themselves to fact-finding expeditions, hearings, press conferences and news releases. One student of Congress has voiced particular concern about the recent move by leaders to make extensive staffs and operating funds available to subcommittees and the proliferation of the subcommittees themselves. Due to the expansion of the committees and subgroups, he reports, elected representatives are kept so busy with a multiplicity of assignments that they have fewer and fewer opportunities to get information from constituents. As a result, they are increasingly required to rely more and more upon the information that staff members pass along.

Owen B. Kiernan, executive director of the National Assn. of Secondary School Principals and a former superintendent and commissioner of education in Massachusetts, is one of education's most forceful voices of protest against what he calls federal intrusion. "Alleged

cooperation flows from the administration and the bureaucracies in Washington," he says, "but it is almost entirely a lip service effort." Kiernan says the outlook for the future presents " a most discouraging picture in Washington" because "there is no evidence of the 'feds' backing off." Education, he says, is "a state responsibility, a local function and a federal concern." The unrelaxed federal pressures, he continues, "could have a disastrous effect on the viability of state and local school systems. Among other deepening concerns is the fact that many of the federal officials in command posts have had absolutely no experience in elementary or secondary education."

As early as 1967, Kiernan was warning other school administrators about the disposition of Congress to rush through "piecemeal programs" using "real or imagined crisis" as an excuse. "Too many 'blue plate specials' have been offered at a time when our state, cry desperately for a full, well-balanced fiscal diet encompassing broad support programs, rather than limited or temporary categorical aid," he said. Federal authorities have a "crash program" emphasis, Kiernan stated, and their "high handedness" has been demonstrated by the lack of public hearings prior to issuing government mandates. Kiernan has praised the state of Florida for announcing that it would not participate in any federal programs which are in conflict with the state's goals, policies, and practices or its ability to finance such programs.

Why Management is Needed

Question: The Xerox coin-op machine in our library is a vital part of the service we provide for students and staff. The current method of payment for copies isn't acceptable. We type a requisition and send it to the business office where they add an account number and send it to purchasing. Purchasing sends a claim form to the Xerox Corp. The Xerox Corp. completes and sends back the purchasing claim form for payment and then the business office finally pays the bill. But our purchasing office pays their bill only once a month so by the time all this bureaucratic paperwork is over we're often two months overdue on our bills. Would simply taking the change, going to the bank, and paying it be acceptable to the district?"

Answer: It's not legal.

—Tacoma (Wash.) School District

Unrealistic Expectations

Part of the problem may be a grand misunderstanding about the capabilities and the role of the public schools. There is an apparent assumption being made in Washington and elsewhere that, given the orders, schools have the capability to do just about anything. Many educators seem to believe this, too. The post-World War II growth period, with its challenges of rebuilding and expansion, represented a great accomplishment throughout the country. Challenges of teaching new skills which had been legislated, like driver training, vocational subjects and health education, appeared to be achieve easily.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 exemplifies the easy expectations held by federal bureaucrats, Congress and its staff members about the public schools. It also appears to reflect a kind of naivete: issue a mandate to educators and they will somehow find the way to make it work.

Although the necessity for written school board policies has been underlined for a quarter of a century by professors of school administration and professional and school boards associations, it took teachers unions and legal challenges from parents to get school boards and administrators to move ahead on written policy. The law historically has been tolerant of the way education is conducted by school boards and educators, unless there is evidence to indicate that school officials had been abusive of their authority. However, the law's "hands off" stance has undergone some radical changes in recent years.

Judges today are asked to make—and do make—decisions in areas of administration which had traditionally been reserved for boards and administrators. Student and teacher dress codes, their school conduct, general behavior and other formerly administrative matters are now being reviewed in the local courts.

Chapter 2.

Establishing a Base: Training and Policies

"I would like to make a comment about superintendents of schools," said David J. Whitmore, Wenatchee, Wash., school board member at a recent convention of the National School Boards Assn. "Every year their salaries go up. But every year their job gets tougher. Superintendents have everyone nipping at their heels—federal and state officials, parents, auditors and board members. It's a tough job."

Central and site administrator salaries have continued generally to rise. According to a February 1978 salary report, based heavily upon a salary survey by the Educational Research Service, administrators' salaries have moved up steadily at all levels each year, but with considerable variations based upon district size and per-pupil expenditures.

Not only have recent administrator salaries tended to be more on a par with those prevailing in profitmaking executive fields, but there has also been a growing interest in fringe benefits as well as salary increases. It is likely that the interest in fringe benefits reflects gains made by teacher groups. There have been gains in unlimited sick leave accumulation, group hospitalization, vision care, dental care, group life insurance and tuition reimbursement.

Some administrative organization leaders are concerned about the impact which tighter state and federal school appropriations could have upon current salary and fringe benefits for administrators—particularly in light of shrinking enrollments. The continuing pleas of administrators for more funds to educate more children, a stock refrain used with considerable success for more than 30 years, no longer has an appeal either to reason or sympathy.

This concern by citizens (which is reflected in the attitudes expressed by many state and federal legislators) appears to explain partially the increased interest of lay citizens in management methods and the quality of university training programs for administrators.

Thomas A. Shannon, former San Diego school administrator who now is executive director of the National School Boards Assn., senses

that "school administration has shifted in a subtle but profound way in the past several years. Many persons actively engaged in school administration are not even aware that the shift has occurred, much less appreciate its magnitude."

Today's school administrator, says Shannon, deals with a student who at 18 years is an adult. He/she must deal with more well-educated parents now than at any time in the past. His/her style of staff leadership requires a whole new approach. He/she must work with a wider spectrum of citizens groups which are increasingly active in schools. The administrator is more vulnerable to the judicial and legislative review of his/her leadership decisions. He/she faces "dramatically expanded expectations of education" and a questioned concept that "education can cure all ills and solve all problems."

To a lesser degree, perhaps, there has been a substantial increase in the knowledge of newer management methods which center about goals, objectives and performance data. This includes members of school boards, some of whom work in enterprises which operate by using these procedures.

Are Training Programs Adequate?

These developments have resulted in many questions about the adequacy of university programs which prepare administrators for service. It has been a tradition in education to regard those who have acquired teaching and administrative certificates as a result of taking university courses to be **fully qualified** for on-the-job service. Today, it is probably more accurate to say that a professional certificate is something which assures only that the individual holding it is qualified **to begin to learn** his or her profession.

Changes in school management requirements have been so great in recent years that many principals and superintendents have wondered aloud why their preparation programs failed to equip them better.

Edwin M. Bridges, professor of education at Stanford U., says assessments of preparation programs by principals pointed to "lack of fit" between their role demands and their academic training. Elementary principals, he says, discount their training in favor of experience on the job as principals or teachers. Less than 2% of the principals covered in a survey, says Bridges, singled out college preparation as an important factor in achieving success. "Most studies show no relationship between formal training and subsequent success in administration," he says. "This pattern holds true in business as well as in education."

Although numbers of years spent in college, years devoted to

graduate study, hours taken in undergraduate education and the numbers of hours taken to earn graduate education credits, are used as measures of educational preparation, they seem to be unrelated to performance, Bridges says. There actually is a negative relationship with courses which deal with leadership, he added.

There is little consensus about future trends in the preparation of school administrators. The use of interns has been received with some favor in a limited number of school districts. There have been some experiments with administrators who possess no educational degrees. For example, it is possible to become a superintendent in California without having educational management training. The superintendent at Newark, N.J., is a management expert, not an educator.

The nature and rate of changed practices for school administration during the 1970s have undoubtedly been a cause of decisions for retirement or reassignment. Where it may have been possible previously for an inadequate administrator to bluff his/her way through to a retirement dinner, there is an apparent trend today toward assessing the pros and cons of an early retirement or shifting to a job outside of a school system.

One of the country's younger superintendents of a big metropolitan school district, having completed all requirements for retirement, submitted his resignation and then had misgivings. His options included several management opportunities in enterprises not related to education, positions in higher education, or assuming another superintendency. "I have every confidence in the world that I could handle any one of dozens of superintendencies," he said, "but maybe life is too short to take all of the hell that goes with the job."

Policies—'The Highest Priority'

One of the greatest untrumpeted advances for public education management during the past decade has been the general adoption by both large and small school districts of written policies by their school boards. Although it has been possible for school boards to simply purchase sets of written policies, like ersatz PPBS systems, most school boards with written policies have a genuine understanding of the way policies serve a school district.

Some school board members—and school administrators—have inappropriate notions about their roles. As elected public officials initially possessing little knowledge or background about the goals and purposes of a school district, they may be inclined to compare their positions with those of partisan municipal or county bodies. Chief school executives may be inclined to interpret every move of a new

How to Help Board Members Succeed

- Provide board members with policy manuals, budget information, related state laws, operational and financial data.
- Keep the board up-to-date on current long-range plans.
- Provide a wide variety of information on a regular basis to all board members, perhaps in weekly packets.
- Provide basic handbooks and guidebooks on such topics as school law, collective bargaining, board duties and responsibilities and school finance.
- Provide information on changes in state law, federal law, regulations, etc.
- Provide updates and information on proposed state and federal legislation.
- Provide members with reports on significant court rulings, labor board rulings and significant awards.
- Ensure that board members gain adequate background in negotiations and employe relations.
- Spend time on how budgets are developed and aid board members in becoming familiar with state accounting procedures.
- Provide board members with regular opportunities to visit and observe schools, programs, personnel and students. Board members shouldn't feel like they're outsiders. Neither should board members take off on their own individual "witch hunts."

- **Boards should regularly review and evaluate their performance, not fault-finding or finger-pointing, but looking for "where we are doing well and where we can improve."**

- **Boards should hold yearly workshops with administrative staff to review goals and objectives and make plans.**

- **Boards should regularly be involved in state and national meetings.**

- **Boards should monitor state agencies such as the department of education, state board of education, professional standards and other commissions.**

- **Boards should budget an appropriate amount of money for adequate in service training at the local, state and national level.**

- **Boards should communicate with legislators and take an active role in state government through contacts with their elected representatives and their state school boards association. Area legislators should be invited to local board meetings on a regular basis.**

- **Board members should be invited, and willing, to participate in local school programs, activities and other civic affairs.**

- **Boards should become very familiar with the school curriculum, staff assignments, activities and other related school statistics.**

- **Board members need to be furnished information on class size, open education, teaching innovations and other educational trends.**

Nick Goble, Public Relations Director,
Pennsylvania School Boards Assn., Harrisburg

board member as motivated by personal advance in a political arena. Thus, the development and possession of sound written board policies can give the board, administrators and the public a sense of public purpose and service which otherwise could be lacking.

A special commission established by the Pennsylvania School Boards Assn. to strengthen board-superintendent working relationships recommended effective policy development as the "highest priority."

Other key responsibilities in this connection, said the Pennsylvania group, include inservice training programs for both board members and administrators, and organized and effective communications.

According to the Pennsylvania school boards group, "management leadership" is a cooperative effort in a school district. It embraces "the school board and all supervisory and school management-level staff through the office of the board's chief executive officer, the superintendent." This kind of leadership approach is necessary to enable the board and administration to "keep children as the focal point" of the management decision-making process and to assure that school management "should be dedicated to representing the general public interest."

The commission offered seven basic guides to school boards and administrators seeking to strengthening a sound working relationship:

- Keep students at the center of the decision-making process.
- Understand the difference between policy and administrative rule.
- Keep each other informed.
- Be tolerant and open-minded.
- Participate in continuing inservice training.
- Exert positive leadership when faced with difficult decisions.
- Assume the proper decision-making role.

This type of relationship between board and administrator is not universal. The Los Angeles City school board of education, for example, has put into operation a management "watch dog unit." This "monitoring unit," which was selected by and reports to the board of education, has as a chief function the making of independent studies and planning outside of the school. Although the findings and proposals of the unit go also to the superintendent of schools, the school board prides

itself in having an agency that works for the board and which is not linked to the administration.

Peter Drucker, famed business consultant and author, believes that boards of directors of private corporations will move in this same direction. One problem being encountered, however, is that the same boards want a "management audit" which covers such elusive elments as management's social values, integrity and creativity, according to Drucker.

Some administrators would argue that there is a greater clarity of vision today on the part of administrators. Union-minded teachers certainly would object to the administrator's claim that he/she serves as their leader and helper. Donald Thomas, superintendent of the Salt Lake City school district, is one superintendent who believes that scientific management is a major factor in improved relationships between school boards and superintendents during the past five years. These are his keys for better relationships:

1. Planned evaluation programs
2. Planned communications programs
3. Accountability procedures
4. Negotiations process

Thomas believes that the typical relationship between the chief administrator and the board may be basically altered in the future. Accountability contracts will appear on the scene in greater numbers, he believes. And the board-superintendent relationship will be based increasingly upon pre-employment agreements.

Larry Cuban, co-author of *Urban School Chiefs Under Fire* and an assistant to six big-city superintendents over a 17-year period, says he learned that superintendents do have an impact upon the districts they serve.

"Some I liked a great deal," he says. "Others I would not share a cab with. Some believed deeply in their divinity; others were just folks. While they varied in personal style, taste and philosophy, the ones I worked for and knew believed that superintendents make a difference in the quality of education. And my observations confirm their beliefs."

Chapter 3.

Management Methods

The growth years of the public schools caused many school boards to give priority to the ability of superintendents to get approval from voters and legislators for adequate funding and to hire principals who could keep a tight rein on students, produce some scholastic and sports winners and keep the teachers happy. School board members and top administrators generally maintained a wary distance from each other. Board members were "citizens." The superintendent was a "professional" and invariably an ex-teacher. The distance usually was dramatized by the superintendent's many pedagogical terms not comprehensible to most board members and seemingly very precise.

The Chasm Still Exists Today.

The late Cecil L. Gilliatt of Shelby, N.C., a past president of the National School Boards Assn., brought the issue into the open at the 1976 American Association of School Administrators convention. "I have a growing concern about the relationship between school boards and school superintendents," he told the administrators. "As I travel about the country, I sense what seems to me to be an increasing distrust between board members and their chiefs. It is a feeling that somehow, somewhere, something is going badly amiss—the sort of feeling the younger generation might classify as 'bad vibes.' I am not certain what is at the root of it. Perhaps it is merely a manifestation of our society—a society that seems to have forgotten how to trust." Gilliatt said school board members want to feel that they are receiving "complete, uncompromising, unfailing, unqualified honesty . . . all of the time . . . about everything," and added that some board members "don't believe they're getting it.

This interpretation is substantiated when a board receives a single recommendation or, perhaps, only one or two alternative choices, Gilliatt said. There is the belief that the superintendent "may be win-

nowing out choices he personally dislikes but board members feel they are entitled to every available scrap of information that might affect their choice," he said.

School board members also dislike being protected against news of possible trouble, according to Gilliatt. "I know that many of us may truly believe that the best way to deal with any problem is to handle it quickly, quietly and sweep the remains out of sight and hope that will be the end of it," he said. "Some administrators may be reluctant to 'bother' their school boards with small troubles—or even big ones." Board members would prefer to hear about trouble directly from the superintendent than to read about it in the newspaper or via a deluge of phone calls, he said.

And, Gilliatt said, "How we do love our professional jargon! It's that mysterious language that identifies us to one another as surely as a fraternity handshake. We like acronyms. We never use one word if two or three or four will possibly do. Finally, he said, "Considerable conflict—much of it unnecessary—stems from boards getting directly involved in administration, and from administrators getting involved in policy-making . . . I'm convinced it happens most often because board members have not been taught the difference between the two functions. Neither have some superintendents."

Kathleen Anderson, a member of the Coupeville, Wash., board of trustees, believes that many hazards in board-superintendent relationships can be minimized by using available management techniques.

The first step should be the development of a job description for the superintendent. It should include both general and specific duties. "This should be reviewed annually so that everyone knows and understands what is expected of the superintendent," explained Anderson in an article written for the magazine of the Washington State School Directors Assn. "This review is a right and a responsibility of both parties in assessing the 'worth' of the superintendent to the district as well as establishing clear communication channels and accountability."

Anderson believes that Management by Objectives (MBO), with its emphasis upon goals, evaluation and time, tends to give a school district a sense of direction which is known not just to the superintendent but to the entire school family.

"The early establishment of goals with the superintendent by the board helps us all to know not only what is to be done, but when the task will be completed, and the results of the action," she said. "These goals should be discussed and agreed upon each year. Established goals are not something to be put in a drawer and forgotten."

It is the "open communication" which is part of the MBO process which Anderson feels is most significant.

A recent survey of executive directors of state school administrator associations indicates that there is very strong interest among school boards and superintendents in using MBO. This contrasts sharply, in their opinion, with PPBS which appears to have a cloudy future in school districts.

Reasons for favoring MBO, they say, are "the need to show progress toward goals," evidence of "leadership and accountability," "organizational demands," "specificity," "the taxpayer revolt," "a needs assessment which forces a targeting time," and "calls for goal identification and measurable results." Another reason why MBO has been in the ascendency while its PPBS cousin, according to the association executives, is rapidly losing ground, may be the fact that school board members are more likely to have an appreciation for the MBO processes than those of PPBS. The latter can sound so technical that it may be intimidating.

Going The Other Way

There are many school board members, however, who would prefer not to be anchored to goals or policy commitments, or even any documentation of public or employe opinion or recommendations. The operation of a public school system is unique when compared with most private and large numbers of public enterprises. "We all know that education is a peculiar business," remarked Gilliatt. "It is, as one writer phrased it, 'the only multi-billion dollar industry in the world where amateurs give the orders and the professional must carry them out.'"

Although the management of other political subdivisions has been increasingly subjected to public scrutiny as well as public participation at open meetings, these agencies lack the long tradition of direct service to youth, their parents and the general public as is the case with schools." City council members, county supervisors and state legislators have apparently been used as models—not necessarily good ones—by some school board members who sought election in order to achieve such specific goals as integration, neighborhood schools, district consolidation or maintenance of the status quo, back to the basics, expanded dramatic arts or the elimination of sex education. And they have used the media to achieve their goal.

Some of these school board members discover that getting results hinges more upon winning the understanding and support of their colleagues than upon getting headlines. They appear to pass through a metamorphosis.

"Our research clearly indicates that it takes at least two years of

school board service before board members gain the background and confidence to perform effectively and confidently," says Nick Goble, public relations director of the Pennsylvania School Boards Assn. (PSBA). "Consequently, a preservice time and the first few years of board service are most important in developing board leadership." Training for school board service is just as important to board members as training for professional educators, he says, and urges that adequate funds be provided for this purpose.

"School districts are usually one of the largest employers in the community," according to Goble. "Board members setting policy for these multi-million dollar enterprises must be informed. They cannot make wise decisions in a vacuum." New school board members "usually come to their new duties with some fixed idea of what the public school did to them or for them," says Goble. "Generally they have no notion of effective boardmanship." PSBA, through regional workshops, stresses these concepts to newly elected board members:

- School board members are state officials. Though elected locally, they serve on behalf of the state legislature.
- School boards are a unit of local government, the only such unit spelled out in the state's constitution.
- School boards are a legislative body, empowered to set policy within the framework of the state legislature.
- School board members represent all of the people within the community, not a particular segment.
- Board members must study all material presented to them in view of the needs of the total community.
- Board members must become thoroughly familiar with the policies and functions of the board.
- Boards are not administrative bodies. Neither should they be "rubber stamps" for professional educators. The fine line between policy and administrative implementation requires "asking the good question" and being fully informed.
- Board should recognize that they represent the public interest. If people ask "Who represents the kids?" tell them board members do. No one else is legally charged to do that.

- Boards should hire superintendents and administrators who thoroughly understand that their role is "to carry out public policy."
- Evaluation of the administration and district employes should be a regular and systematic process based on written policies.
- School boards have three main responsibilities: **planning, making policy** and **evaluation.**

New Mandates on Employment

Among the major changes in education management requirements in recent years have been employment policies and procedures. Mandates to employ more teachers who were non-white or women were complicated by the enrollment decline.

It has been presumed that because women teachers represent the majority of the teaching force but only a small segment of school administration, this clearly demonstrated discrimination by the top hierarchy in school administration and on school boards. This would appear to be true. One of the disconcerting findings in recent years is that the number of women administrators continues to decline despite all mandates and efforts to increase their numbers. Women activists are certain the statistics amount to a prima facie case that sex discrimination is continuing. The statistics are very lopsided. In Pennsylvania, there is only one woman among 504 superintendents. In Minnesota, according to Bernard W. Kaye, associate superintendent for personnel at Minneapolis, the decline in women administrators has been going on for decades. Women elementary principals declined nationally from a majority of 55% in 1929 to 19.6% by 1973. He studied the decline in the number of women administrators among superintendents, principals and assistant principals between 1970-71 and 1972-73 and noted that the rate was about 1% a year.

Teaching is one field in which women have historically predominated. The percentage of women teachers reached 90% in 1890. But by 1972 the percentage had dropped to 66%. The enrollment decline plus the opening up of careers to college-trained women in many fields may affect the composition of the teaching force for years to come.

Another factor is that many teachers, both men and women, find the salaries, fringe benefits, retirement benefits and working conditions in schools to be comparable or better than in other professions.

"We should not lose sight of the fact that many . . . will choose to stay in teaching and non-administrative positions," observed Kaye.

"These people are performing important roles and are deriving a great deal of satisfaction from doing so. They view these positions as their career goals and this should be respected."

And some administrators want to return to classroom duty. Some do. Actually, the basic training of almost all administrators was not to manage an elementary or secondary educational unit or entire school system, but only one aspect of a single classroom unit.

There is little opportunity for administrators to gain on-the-job knowledge, particularly the kind which may deal with management planning and procedures, effective communication with many different kinds of "audiences" and individuals, the establishment of needs assessments, goal and objective-setting techniques and program and organization evaluation methods.

Training Programs—A Weak Link

Universities which educate administrators are continually criticized for the weakness of their administrative preparation programs. During the past half century, administrator tasks and challenges have evolved so rapidly that those inside education—in the universities and on the job—may have failed to appreciate the rate of change. Outdated personnel policies and communications efforts undeniably were chief causes of the quick and easy inroads made in the unionizing of teachers and other school employes. Although logically it would seem that special management expertise would be needed for employe communications in a decentralized school system, this is one of the most neglected areas of administrator preparation. The same is true of programs in public relations for educators.

"We can quickly name a number of major challenges facing school administrators: collective bargaining, school finance, declining enrollments, accountability, federal and state mandates, equal educational opportunity, special interests and, scariest of all—the future," said a Wisconsin superintendent at a recent National School Boards Assn. convention. "While boards of education and administrators are wringing their hands over these problems, what, in fact, is being done to train administrators to competently cope with these dilemmas?" asked Supt. Roger G. Lowney of Merrill, Wis. "Very little, I'm afraid." He said administrators had been forced to rely upon "primitive cunning and guile" to successfully handle today's management problems.

"In colleges and universities the preparatory programs for the elementary principalship appear to be relics of the past age," declared a report from the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Adminis-

EPS/NSBA Educational Policies Service of the National School Boards Association	Current EPS File: BK (Also AFA) Original File: BCBL

EVALUATION OF SCHOOL BOARD OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

This form will evaluate how you think the board works as a team in governing the school district. Using the numbering system below, rate each item and return this form, unsigned, to the superintendent's office.

1 - Excellent
2 - More than I expect
3 - What I would expect
4 - Less than I expect
5 - Poor

	1	2	3	4	5
1. A systematic, ongoing program is conducted by the superintendent and staff to provide board members with information pertinent to their responsibilities.					
2. A systematic program is conducted by the staff to orient newly elected or appointed board members to their responsibilities and to acquaint them with board policies and operating procedures.					
3. The board operates according to written policies, and updates policies at least annually; policy revisions are considered whenever necessary.					
4. Both board and staff adhere to policy once policy is adopted.					
5. The board acts as policymaking and governance body and holds the superintendent responsible for the administration and evaluation of school programs.					
6. The board, before deciding any matter (other than the superintendent's contract), provides the superintendent with ample opportunity to develop staff recommendations for action.					
7. The board does not respond to emotional pressure. It provides the superintendent with opportunity to develop policy proposals and does not write "instant policy" under the gun of emergencies.					
8. The board conducts its meetings in a climate of free, open, but orderly discussion.					
9. The board has adequate understanding of and skill in following parliamentary procedure.					
10. Board members come to meetings prepared to contribute to discussions and do not waste meeting time by asking for information that has already been provided.					

EPS/NSBA Educational Policies Service of the National School Boards Association	Current EPS File: BK (Also AFA)
	Original File: BCBL

	1	2	3	4	5
11. Board members are representatives of the entire community and not of special interest groups, and are committed to the welfare of the public schools.	—	—	—	—	—
12. When considering recommendations of citizens' and special interest groups, the board reports its reactions and reasons which may not allow it to implement all recommendations.	—	—	—	—	—
13. The board and superintendent work comfortably together and in a spirit of mutual confidence. The superintendent respects the governance responsibility of the board; the board respects the day-to-day executive responsibility of the superintendent.	—	—	—	—	—
14. The board and superintendent are diligent in writing policies that are sufficiently comprehensive; the administration has the authority to deal with most day-to-day problems without turning to the board for guidance.	—	—	—	—	—
15. The board has developed, in cooperation with the superintendent, a set of criteria which are used as the basis for evaluating the performance of the superintendent at least annually.	—	—	—	—	—
16. The board approaches its evaluation of the superintendent fairly and diligently.	—	—	—	—	—
17. Official actions of board members concern only the welfare of the school system; no member uses the office of school board member for personal profit, advancement or patronage.	—	—	—	—	—
18. Members are careful to speak on issues in the community as individual board members in reflection of the fact that only the entire board can decide a certain course of action.	—	—	—	—	—
19. The board regards the setting of goals and objectives, making of long-range plans, establishing of priorities, and developing of policies as its major ongoing responsibilities.	—	—	—	—	—

SOURCE: McLean County Unit District No. 5, Normal, Illinois
DATE: 7/77

DISTRICT SIZE: K-12; 6,519 students

tration at the U. of Oregon. "Course content seems to emphasize studies about education. There is little evidence that any real consideration has been given to the experiences that will develop in a prospective elementary school principal, the knowledge, skills and critical insights needed to assess the consequences of alternative strategies."

And, Laurence T. Mayher, as director of the Citizens Council for Ohio Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, studied administrator training programs and predicted "resistance to significant change from several quarters" and "real threats" against redesign.

"The threats may be to students who like the relative ease of getting their MA's on a long-term basis and want to study administration regardless of their qualifications," he said in an article in *The Administrator*, or "to professors of educational administration who are not equipped to do new things that may be required and fear de-emphasis on courses they now teach; to deans who may be reluctant to share subsidies with other departments whose talents may be needed. These threats may be painful but the stakes are too high to let them interfere with constructive action."

That something may be radically wrong with the traditional pattern offered by universities for administrator training has been signaled by the "academy" seminar programs. These have been developed by the state and national associations including the American Assn. of School Administrators, National Assn. of Secondary School Principals and the National School Boards Assn. They differ radically from programs offered by the universities. They usually last from one day to one week. They are professionally managed and are designed to attract "customers" who are not particularly interested in course credit for salary purposes, but, rather, want knowledge for immediate application on the job. Instructors are most likely practicing administrators or specialists in the subject matter of the topic of the seminar. And a few large districts have started their own programs.

The seminar programs, like those of the American Management Assn. and many industries and business firms, have had to succeed on their own merits. They necessarily must be planned and carried out with the needs of the participants in mind rather than institutional or staff desires. However, a majority of administrators and school boards have not given their enthusiastic support to these developments. There are few realistic budgets for inservice training, and participation in the seminars sometimes must be financed personally by district administrators.

This situation could change as the 1977 federal Teacher Center legislation is implemented. The law, promoted by the National Education Assn. and American Federation of Teachers, creates school district

inservice training programs under federal financing. The programs, according to the law, must operate under a governing board composed of a majority of teacher members in a school district. Congress, while providing for inservice training programs under the jurisdiction of teaching employes, opens the door for equal opportunities to non-teaching employes and to administrators, and there have been indications from the Carter Administration that it will support the idea. The precedent of teacher-controlled, publicly-financed inservice training programs could eventually result in more comprehensive programs that include all employes. At least one state, Pennsylvania, has launched its own inservice training program for administrators through the state education department.

The Management Team—What It Is and Isn't

Some students of school administration like to believe that the swift rise of "the management team" in public education is due to recognition of modern management requirements by school leaders. This is not necessarily true. Executive directors of state administrator and school board associations conclude from their continuing contacts with many board members and administrators that it is more a case of defensive action taken in hopes that those in "middle management" will not unionize to follow the precedent of teachers. According to Norman Hall, assistant to the superintendent at Dallas and current president of the American Assn. of School Administrators, there is a feeling among some chief administrators that team-building results in loss of "authority" and an increase in responsibilities for the chief administrator.

The big problem, according to Hall, is a widespread lack of understanding of what the management team concept is all about. This is true especially of principals, he believes, suggesting that only recently have universities been conveying management team principles to those who seek administrative training. "Only administrators with recent college training are inclined to operate under the management team idea," Hall said. "Therefore, widespread use of this concept may be some time in the future."

Although newer management methods have been emphasized in recent years in university schools of business, what happens in the individual company, as is the case in a school district, depends largely on the quality and vigor of the upper management echelons. Business organizations, however, are not subjected to the tremendous counter pressures which, for years, have worked against management team building at the school district level.

There are separate training programs for superintendents, elementary and secondary school principals. In some instances, the state legislatures or departments of education have required that separate certificates be issued for various administrative categories. There are separate professional associations at the national level and in most states for superintendents, secondary and elementary principals. There are separate national journals and newsletters and separate academies and seminar programs.

The universities and state athletic associations tend to maintain direct contact with school principals, especially in secondary schools, rather than with school district management. This is also true of accrediting bodies. The existence of many hundreds of separate elementary and secondary school districts also has tended to convey the notion that school buildings are under separate and independent managements rather than part of large operating units. The abrupt break in jurisdictions between elementary and secondary grades underlines "separateness" in the educational organization.

In many districts, the administrative tradition has been built upon the belief, especially in secondary schools, that high school and junior high school chief administrators should function semi-independently. "I would tell my principals, 'You go out there and run that school,'" said a retired midwestern superintendent. "'If you have trouble, you handle it. I don't want to know about it.'"

The belief that a school district is composed of independent parts has been fostered generally by school administration and, to a degree, by school boards and the public. It still persists despite evidence that what happens in one building may affect all school buildings. An issue involving a student newspaper or the suspension of students, as examples, a few years ago would not have caused a stir outside the attendance area of a high school, but today might involve a hearing before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In the past salaries and fringe benefits were set by establishing ratios between basic teacher schedules and administrative pay. Insurance, hospitalization and other fringe benefits were made available to administrators on the same basis as for teachers. This began to change for principals when working conditions and other provisions unrelated directly to compensation began to be negotiated into contracts. In some districts this happened without the involvement or even the knowledge of principals. Yet principals were generally held responsible for administrating and fulfilling the management obligations written into contracts. Even more important was the termination of ratio schedules. Frequently this occurred when there appeared to be inadequate funds available to finance bargained teacher salary increases. To principals

and others it appeared that administrators were being deprived of higher salaries in order to finance teacher salary increases.

The term "management team" had little meaning for administrators in the field. Top management had trouble explaining what the "team" meant to other administrators. One was finding a common denominator. Professors of education in some universities muddied the definitions by deciding that "management" was a demeaning term and could not be equated with administration. This argument was settled rather quickly through a few rounds of formal bargaining sessions. One of the major differences between "management" in industry and in public education was that the top boss, the superintendent, tended to be temporary in many school districts. School board members had the same characteristic. Frequently those who did decide to stay on the school board might have singleminded purposes for being board members—to advance or retard desegregation, to promote the fundamentals or to "get" one or more of the administrators.

These factors motivated principals and other administrators to conclude that self-preservation and some form of group bargaining made more protective sense than a "management team." The administrators made it clear they wanted some assurance that "team" meant more than occasional social events and that there were assurances of involvement and decision-making compatible to that being afforded teachers, custodians and bus drivers through collective bargaining. Unfortunately, many superintendents and school board members reacted negatively, declaring that principals and others should accept their "team" role and trust that their interests would be protected. The generalized talk about "management teams" in the national associations has failed to shape working prototypes of models which can be presented to school administrators and board members.

But Dallas Found a Way

One exception was "The Dallas Plan," which was presented at a session of the AASA convention by Supt. Nolan Estes. The Dallas approach to a management team involved a full-fledged recognition of a factor which appeared to have stumped other chief executives and administrative groups. Some organizational device had to be "invented" which allowed administrators of the district to present their ideas and recommendations to the superintendent through a process which involved assurances of true representation, action preceded by thorough study and a way to prevent a superintendent from simply pocketing proposals and refusing to forward them to the board.

The Dallas administrators created a plan which subsequent experience has indicated overcame traditional problems. They established the Dallas School Administrators Assn. "Leadership Council" to serve as an advisory group to the superintendent. The council is a legislative body, composed of elected representatives of central office and field administrators. The council receives requests from the superintendent to develop management proposals or it can create its own. When a proposal is formally considered by the council and adopted, it is transmitted to the superintendent for consideration. He/she can accept the proposal or veto it or any of its parts. In any event, the proposal is forwarded next to the school board along with the full statement of the viewpoint of the council.

After a year of experience with the council and the procedure, Estes and the administrators agreed to several refinements. The council was reorganized so that its subcommittees matched with each subcommittee of the school board. They work with the central administration liaison staff to help develop agendas for the subcommittees. According to Estes, such close contact enables the board to be more aware of problems facing managers at the school level.

Another assignment of the council is to help the school board become more aware of management problems because, according to Estes, the board at one time made too many decisions without knowing their impacts upon administrators. "Often problems came to the board that could have been solved earlier if we had had an effective vehicle to make them [board members] more aware of these problems," he said.

Board members are invited to lunch with principals following monthly area meetings of the principals. Principals are encouraged to attend board meetings and to express their viewpoints on issues under discussion. Estes has suggested that the group organize and conduct monthly workshops for board members on specific management problems. Principals are involved in orientation programs for new board members, and individual principals are recognized for their services and achievements by the board's community affairs committee. These activities of council members in board activities are spelled out in board policies and administrative rules and regulations. Estes believes that the establishment of stronger ties and working relationships between administrators and their school boards had been limited by traditions and customs rather than determined by the principles of good management.

Other Team Approaches

The technique of coordinating administrators' opinions on issues has been adopted or "discovered" by other school district management

groups. At Yakima, Wash., the administrator group uses the "position paper" to get unity. Supt. Warren D. Starr said the technique is readily available to any administrator group seeking "a reasonable time line" for vital administrative decisions. He said the position paper "is merely an agreement in writing between the chief administrator and the management team members which states the opportunity, the tentative proposal and a reasonable method of evaluation."

At Yakima, the topics for the position papers are selected by an administrative council. Individual members may also nominate topics. In an article written for the NASSP *Bulletin* (January 1978), Starr said the procedure during its first year had resulted in reducing friction with the management group. There have been side benefits in administrator-teacher relations because some principals began to use the same technique with their teachers.

AASA Exec. Dir. Paul Salmon suggests the "educational impact statement" as a parallel idea for building management team cohesiveness. The impact statement, under the Salmon procedure, would be required by the school board to accompany every policy recommendation. Administrators would be involved in the statement development by being given a full description of the proposed action with adequate technical information and sufficient time to study the matter. Individual administrators would prepare group statements that provide for dissenting opinions. The superintendent would be required to study and use the management group data in preparing an administrative impact statement for the board.

"A crisis situation now exists in many administrative teams," according to Salmon. "The use of the educational impact statement will provide for increased input by management at every level."

The Pennsylvania School Boards Assn., whose executive director Fred M. Heddinger is a former management consultant, has pioneered new approaches to strengthen the management operation of school districts. One of the few states with legally authorized teacher strikes, Pennsylvania schools clearly needed strong board-management teamwork and understanding.

"Principals, for the most part, are now telling us that they are being involved in the management process and that their authority is not being eroded by the collective bargaining process, even though the inroads that this process has had are still disturbing," Heddinger reports.

Relationships between school boards and administrators and local lay control of schools have been identified by the association as the two major areas for both research and action. A few years ago the organization devoted two days to a seminar on development of school management teams.

Hanover, Pa., board member Sam Lobach, an executive with a manufacturing firm, declared during the program that "only through mutual communication and understanding can the team concept really work . . . sometimes, down deep, some administrators and boards don't want to assume their responsibilities. There is a way to put it together. It will take time, patience and a spirit of cooperation by every segment of school leadership."

Howard Newson, superintendent of the Titusville, Pa., schools and a 32-year veteran in education, said he makes use of a variety of techniques to bring administrators and board members closer together. Summer retreats are a favorite method for achieving mutual awareness, he said. "I would also like to have my administrators at every board meeting," Newton added. "I want them to try to understand what it's like to be in their [the board's] shoes. And that's a two-way street. The board needs to understand at first hand their concerns and problems."

Some management methods, such as management by objectives, offer ways to encourage team work at all management levels. Modern MBO plans stress the individual involvement. Unfortunately, early MBO models originating in industry are essentially "by boss's orders" arrangements, with one-sided goal setting, communication and judgments. This has caused administrators with limited exposure to such techniques to shun MBO.

Estes stresses the importance of "giving all members of the 'team,' which includes all management level personnel—a political parity with all other vested interests."

One of the most important steps, he says, is "to keep the structure as simple as possible, considering the fact that we are managing a huge, public organization. We have attempted to keep the layers of bureaucracy from stacking up any higher than absolutely necessary."

Chapter 4.

Management Approaches

Much of management in public education and other fields today is what some have called "reaction management." This consists of trying to respond to actions initiated by others. The direction and work of the organization, in effect, is decided by those outside of the organization.

One of the major concerns which school administrators voice about the involvement of the federal government in the operation of public schools is the apparent assumption by distant elected officials and bureaucrats that school administrators and boards should be mere reactors. Similar pressures are brought by others, including state governments, other political subdivisions and public and private organizations.

Those who bring the pressures to bear usually ignore the impact of their decisions on other aspects of the educational program.

Concern about injuries to children riding on skateboards, for example, might give parents a reason to petition the school board—why not a study unit or an entire course on skateboard safety? The documentation of apparent need can be shown in terms of skinned knees and broken arms. The fact that the introduction of such a course could displace instruction time for the teaching of reading or writing arouses little concern.

The absence of a well-organized educational plan based on formal goals derived from expressed community needs makes school boards, administrators and other employes highly vulnerable to such pressures.

Traditional goals frequently have been compilations of high-sounding hopes sometimes cribbed from one or more educational philosophy textbooks and adopted by school boards because someone said goals were needed. One of the major developments in recent years in education, industry and government has been the evolvement of management approaches based upon carefully selected goals, keyed directly to specific activities for achieving the goals.

In education, the emphasis on "process" has, until very recently, over-shadowed goal setting. By moving annually from grade to grade,

Johnny was expected to have experienced normal conditions for learning reading, writing and arithmetic. When this did not occur, it was believed that something must be wrong with Johnny, not the "system." The movement to make education goal-and objective-oriented began in the 1960s. The same basic pattern of planning began to be applied to such diverse operations as personnel evaluation, competency-based education, instruction of the handicapped and culturally deprived students, plus the overall plan for operation of the school district and individual building units.

In a typical school district plan for management by objectives (MBO), the process begins with the adoption of goals for the next year. Goals are formulated by the school boards. This action ideally is preceded by some planned effort to try to discern—from community and staff opinion, test results, follow-up studies of graduates, and other evidences of the *results* of instruction—the educational needs of students. The continued problem of sufficient school operating funds in light of declining enrollments, according to some school administrators, will undoubtedly force school districts to devote more efforts to determine instructional requirements for students. The alternative will be to accept further curriculum mandates from state and federal levels.

MBO, when built into a system involving all management and employe levels, offers many advantages to school districts. This type of MBO not only encourages, but depends on, widespread employe participation.

The basic goals for the school district, as determined by the board of education, become the basis for deciding objectives at the school building and classroom levels and even for individuals in each job. The setting of individual objectives by principals, supervisors, teachers, custodians, secretaries and others which are in harmony with the district wide objectives ties everyone to the school system program.

School MBO, reports James Lewis Jr. in *School Management by Objectives*, "provides a means for systematically conducting long- and short-range planning; it improves control and coordination in the school by keeping check (periodic and annual) on all the activities of the school; it makes for maximum utilization of school personnel through the distribution of time, work load and compensation through the review of job performance; it establishes a more effective method for appraising the performance of school personnel by the objective nature of the specific performance objectives; and it fosters better training development programs through workshops or personal development objectives."

George S. Odiorne, author of *Management and the Activity Trap*, said that, in the absence of goals and objectives, there is increasing

attention to activities which, even though they may be meaningless, become false goals and the basis for making bad decisions. Finally, "the good people who work in such an organization shrink. . . . The organization, having drained its employes of their zest, finds itself peopled with zombies," Odiorne said. The larger the organization, the worse the situation can get, he added. Layers of organization heighten the effects of the trap. The further down people are in the organization, the more they shrink, he said.

Thus, a vigorous, effective school district may depend on the willingness of its leaders to establish and examine goals, involving others in the process.

A few school districts and business firms have learned that MBO, when fully understood and used, not only helps to bring about individual job satisfaction in a large organization but also presents the setting for a personalized development program. In the typical school district, where administrator-to-employe ratios are large, the self-monitoring and self-supervision features of individual objective setting can not only help the overburdened administrator with his/her tasks but also improve communications with those he/she supervises.

As Dan C. Lortie pointed out in *School-Teacher*, teachers must have psychic rewards revolving about classroom achievement, if they are to find achievement in their work. Goals must be meaningful to the classroom teacher. "Official statements of school objectives and daily reality of classroom teaching are not the same thing," Lortie said. For example, ways must be found to penetrate abstract and ambiguous language. Uncertainty about the outcomes of classroom teaching, he said "plagues many teachers." Thus, the building of a positive and personalized type of performance review into the goal-setting cycle can have tremendous implications for stimulating achievement and high morale.

A Shaky Beginning

Two major errors were made by a good many school districts in their first efforts to use PPBS or MBO. First, the systems don't assure success, except to the extent that they offer a road map to chosen goals with alternative routes. Secondly, they potentially afford a maximum degree of participation in planning and determining objectives. Finally, either system offers each participant the answer to two vital questions: "What am I supposed to be doing?" and "How well am I doing?"

PPBS calls for these basis steps:

1. Set goals after making an analysis of situation and needs

2. Develop objectives designed to achieve goals

3. Study alternative programs

4. Review budget costs, benefits and resources

5. Choose the most suitable programs

6. Carry out program

7. Assess the results

8. Review and plan new cycle

MBO requires this sequence of steps:

1. Set goals

2. Develop objectives

3. Feed back performance evaluation

4. Conduct quarterly operations reviews

5. Make individual appraisals

6. Review organization performance

7. Review goals and reset objectives

These cycles, in turn, have parallels with school and organizational plans for performance evaluation of individuals:

1. Establish work goals and standards

2. Set individual target objectives

3. Assure systematic feedback and sharing of performance information

4. Make self-evaluation and supervisory evaluation

5. Take follow-up actions

PPBS came to the attention of school administrators a few years earlier than did MBO. This was about the same time that school costs, fueled by higher salaries and still-increasing enrollments, were causing school operating costs to escalate. The words "budgeting" and "system" undoubtedly captured greater interest and imagination of administrators and board members than did "planning" and "programming," which were assumed to be taking place anyway.

"Budgeting" was the big word. It caused most school officials to assume that PPBS was actually a tool for the business department of the school district. This conclusion was reinforced by the Assn. of School Business Officials (ASBO) which embraced PPBS. In fact, the organization, during workshops held for its members on the subject, decided to insert an "E" (for evaluation) so that the ASBO version became PPBES.

"Too much emphasis upon budgeting and nowhere nearly enough on planning and evaluation," is the way William H. Curtis, former AASA president and a consultant on PPBS for many years, sized up the failure of the system to gain better acceptance. Although continued pressure on school districts will keep PPBS alive, Curtis believes there are serious counter pressures. PPBS too often has not been applied as a total system, but has been distorted to build program budgets upon current or past practices rather than being "future-oriented," he said. "There has been too much emphasis upon support service implementation and comparatively little upon curriculum."

School board funding of the design, development and implementation of PPBS has been inadequate, Curtis says. Despite the use of PPBS by teacher organizations at the state and national level, local teacher groups view it as a threat to their organizations, he says. The term PPBS, however, may be passing out of the picture, according to its champions. "The initials PPBS will probably disappear," says Harry J. Hartley, vice president for finance, of Connecticut, who is known widely for his work as a consultant and writer on applications of PPBS in public school districts. But, adds Hartley, "The concept of a program budget is here to stay and will be expanded." The accountability movement, he says, has firmly established the concept of program costs and results. This approach is easier for school board members, teachers and the public to understand. PPBS has helped to answer questions about program objectives, costs, evaluations, priorities and alternatives. When the time comes for retrenchment, the program budget format has enabled boards to reduce or eliminate programs from the budget with greater ease and understanding, he says.

Some of the obstacles to the development of PPBS have come from administrators inclined to keep program costs and priorities from the

public, Hartley believes. This is best accomplished through line-item budget formats. Other administrators have run into staff resistance to innovations. Also, he says, some school board members lose interest when they find that PPBS is not, in itself, a fast and easy way to reduce budget cuts. The "musts" for PPBS success, he says, include:

1. Active involvement by the chief administrator. It is an error to turn the project over to the business manager—and expect the instructional staff to be enthusiastic about PPBS.

2. Teachers and building-level administrators must be involved in PPBS before it becomes a fact. They must have good inservice training in PPBS.

3. There must be a key coordinator for PPBS in the central office.

4. Commitment of people, money, time and other resources is essential to success.

5. Program and budget planning must recognize the human dimensions involved in accountability.

6. There must be no hidden agendas.

PPBS – Around the Country

At Fairfield, Conn., where PPBS is "alive and well—though modified," John Greenhalyh, assistant superintendent for business, says it is difficult to get "rank-and-file" understanding of PPBS. Nevertheless, PPBS is firmly rooted in that district and he predicts it will continue as "an accounting process and aid to carrying out needs assessments, competency-based instruction and clarifying cost-benefit operations."

Clement C. Sutton, PPBS coordinator for the Detroit schools, says that one of the major plus factors of PPBS is the fact that its activities are not simply a one-time measurement. They continue on a year-round basis.

In a dozen states, school districts are likely to continue to use PPBS or MBO because legislatures or state boards of education have mandated the principles or procedures which underlie them. In Indiana, for example, a law requires the State Board of Education's Commission on

General Education to "make an analysis of a single unified system of budgetary preparation and accounting based upon the concept of the planning and program budget systems." Local districts were required to "adopt and fully and accurately implement the budgetary system" in 1977.

The South Carolina Dept. of Education in 1970 embarked on a five-year program, concentrating upon goals identified in 11 major need areas. Budgets were shifted to the PPBS format.

California embraced PPBS with much trumpeting. The legislature produced mandates for the state board of education to carry out which would encourage districts to use PPBS. School boards were required, after a given date, to prepare their budgets in a PPBS format.

"PPBS has not brought about a significant change in school district resource allocation policies or procedures," was the unequivocal conclusion made by John M. Rajcic, associate superintendent of the Irvine (Calif.) Unified School District, in an article for *Thrust*, magazine of the Assn. of California School Administrators. "Changing the budget format from the traditional function/object budget to the program budget gives the appearance of significant change in the budgetary process," he said. "However, the decision-making process for budget preparation remains basically unchanged. It is not the structure of the budget document that is important, but the decisions made in the preparation of the document."

At least one enterprising firm offered to sell California school administrators a "kit" which would enable them to discharge their state obligation by switching figures from a conventional budget to a PPBS format. A few years after the mandate the state board of education was directed by the state legislature to discontinue its investigation of PPBS.

In the wake of the court decision calling upon the New Jersey legislature to establish a school system which would provide "a thorough and efficient" educational program for all students, PPBS and MBO gained entrance to school districts throughout the state.

The legislature passed "the T&E (thorough and efficient) law" (Public School Education Act of 1975) which mandated school boards to: 1) establish educational goals, 2) develop objectives, 3) develop measurement instruments, 4) set standards, 5) develop educational programs and 6) evaluate how well the programs were accomplishing what they were set up to do.

By mid-1977 almost 90% of the school districts in the state had completed the goal-setting phase, according to the state department of education; 21% had made a needed assessment; 5% had made an initial program evaluation.

"As a result of working together on T&E, we've learned more

about ourselves, others and the common problems and issues we all face," reported Supt. Ernest Barlow Jr. of Merchantville, a small rural district and a T&E pilot district. Communication within the staff and in the community had greatly improved. Differences of opinion were being worked out constructively. "Today we see all school planning and activities as a T&E activity," said Barlow.

The Story of MBO

Fred Schwarz, author, business consultant and professor of management at the U. of Wisconsin, has been a close observer of the development of MBO in school systems. He sees plans gaining much wider acceptance because of the change in management priorities caused by declining enrollments. The great need to "become more cost effective" will bring about the adoption of MBO systems which appear to be fair and realistic, he says. Schwarz recommends a switch to "Education by Objectives (EBO)." Some administrative styles thwart MBO, he says, and there should be greater emphasis upon improving the "motivational climate" by providing for individual staff MBOs for career planning. Schwarz is greatly concerned about the apparent preoccupation by administrators to "measure" rather than to "motivate."

Terrel H. Bell, former U.S. commissioner of education and a Utah administrator, says that a sound MBO operation is essential in the current time of rising education costs and increasing educational expectations. Bell says that MBO may be more acceptable if it is focused upon the performance of the institution rather than the performance of individuals who work in it. When he was superintendent of the Granite, Utah, school district with 63,000 students and 72 schools he originated an MBO program and later authored a book on the subject.

"MBO provides the school administrator with a systematic procedure for involving his staff in problem-solving efforts," says Bell. "If properly executed, MBO can be democratic in the best traditions of involving professional colleagues in participatory management. MBO keeps all staff members looking at the same targets and pulling toward performance outcomes that faculty members have accepted as desirable objectives worthy of special attention and concern. MBO provides the road map that all can read and from which all can attain a certain sense of momentum and accomplishment during the year."

Douglas Ritchie, superintendent of the Madison, Wis. school district, has had one of the longest continuing experiences with an MBO plan in the nation. He sees MBO as affording a sound method for dealing with contemporary problems like declining enrollments. "All vibrant,

successful school systems will have a management system with district goals, management contracts (performance contracts with individual administrators), sound evaluation and appropriate salary plans," he predicts. "School boards will insist upon management systems."

Ritchie, who takes part in many seminars for school administrators on MBO, believes that the attitudes of some administrators are the chief obstacles to good MBO plans. "There are administrators who do not want to be on target, who are comfortable doing what they always have done," Ritchie says. "Another problem is the professors of education who believe that somehow management will take care of itself."

At Grove City, Ohio, located outside Columbus, the South-Western City Schools became heavily engaged in what was called a "PPbS" plan in the earlier 1970s. (The small "b" was to indicate de-emphasis upon "budget"—or at least it was an attempt to keep the word from getting the overemphasis suffered in other districts.) After three years, MBO was initiated under a plan which involved all employes, certified and classified. Each individual has personal goals in connection with his/her job, his/her relationship with students and other staff members.

While employes in other schools had operated under MBO, Highland Park School in the South-Western district was the first to extend MBO to individual plans. Arthur W. Stellar, then principal of the school, says the plan was given no name. "If you can get away with it, I would recommend that you not label MBO as such until after it has been completely implemented," Stellar says. "When announcing a new educational venture, people line up for and against the proposal, and the debate is off and running. The project is assessed, usually by critics, long before it has had a chance to mature." In his opinion, "opponents begin spending more time building defenses than improving the innovation and making it workable, and in a suprisingly short time the change that was hailed as capable of solving old problems has become a problem itself. The promising innovation may become watered down, dropped or subjected to a backlash," Stellar concludes.

Supt. Jack P. Taylor of Shaker Heights, Ohio, says one important aspect of any management system of this type is that it provide for long-range planning in a broad sense—to include "a thorough, systematic and realistic means-ends assessment of resources and objectives of all concerned parties within the context of an overall educational philosophy."

Although the Shaker Heights district has long enjoyed a national reputation for high academic standards, Taylor says that when he arrived on the scene he discovered the district lacked a systematic long-range plan for developing or upgrading the system's physical plant. Mainte-

nance had been good but the electrical system and the plumbing were outmoded. There were many leaking roofs. No district survey had been made of available classroom space and utilization options. There was no long-term projection of student enrollment. Taylor found that these were activities in which the board simply had not shown interest.

"It is imperative for school districts to begin to engage in such planning, because in too many districts there is a built-in tendency toward ridigity and inertia where little else is accomplished beyond maintaining the status quo or reacting to daily on-going problems," Tayor warns. He agrees with Hartly that "systematic planning is a way of attempting somewhat to control the future instead of merely reacting to it and being controlled by it."

The use of the PPBS acronym is on the way out, for the most part," predicts William Curtis. "The same may be true of MBO, ERMS, RADS and others. But we have learned a great deal from the application of these various concepts and from them we are designing, developing and implementing better models. From here on, greater emphasis will be placed on better educational planning, more effective allocation and utilization of resources, and stronger evaluation procedures to determine how well those resources were utilized. Personally, I hope the acronyms do fade from the scene and that educational planning as a total system will succeed them."

Setting School District Goals

Whether the establishment or adjustment of school district goals should precede or follow a needs assessment seems to be an open question in school districts over the country. The important aspect is that this survey is conducted frequently. Communities, attitudes, manpower and social needs—all are subject to a rate of change which comes faster than is realized by many educators. The fast decline in the birth rate taking place some years ahead of the time that school boards and administrators began to plan what steps could or should be taken. More than one school board has wasted money or space resources by keeping one or more schools open "a little longer" rather than face the obvious need for planning.

The Texas School Boards Assn. (TSBA) defines a "needs assessment" as a "systematic determination of the importance, size, or value of things lacking which are desirable, requisite, or useful. In a local school district this assessment of need should include a look at the community in which the district operates, the wishes of the students in the district, the desires of the parents, the temper of society in general, the world of work in the state and country and a look at the future."

A **DEEP** model (**D**efining and **E**valuating **E**ducational **P**rogramming) is suggested by TSBA as a needs assessment guide with these steps:

1. Assess general needs using parents, students, community, state and national indicators.
2. Develop goal statements based upon the identified perceived needs.
3. Prioritize goals.
4. Determine tasks a student must perform to achieve selected goals.
5. Develop measurable learner objectives for each of the identified tasks.
6. Determine district educational programming status.
7. Identify "immediate" learner needs.
8. Select educational programming to meet identified needs.
9. Evaluate educational programming.

By the time Step 4 is reached it is necessary for management to assess available resources to learn which top priority goals can be dealt with effectively. This is the most difficult step, according to TSBA in its book, *Accountability in Education*. This involves describing what is being done presently in the same format as above.

Since educational programming typically is oriented toward teachers rather than students, this is sometimes difficult. A similar challenge is that most of the curriculum is defined in terms of material to be covered and not desirable student goals. There also is little knowledge about whether the educational programming actually is accomplishing what it claims.

Identifying immediate needs means deciding the differences between what is desired and what is present. This is the "discrepancy." After learner needs have been established, it becomes necessary to decide upon the type of educational programming required to meet them.

Fenwick W. English and Roger A. Kaufman in their book, *Needs*

Assessment, Focus For Curriculum Development, recommend that "the process of needs assessment should precede any implementation of PPBS, MBO, systems analysis, writing behavioral objectives for teachers or students, or curriculum development."

The needs assessment process, points out William D. White, director of program development for the Jefferson Co. Schools, Lakewood, Colo., cannot be regarded as the only way to make decisions. For example, he points out that alternative schools have been established without a needs assessment. Data collected and summarized also will tend to minimize requirements of special groups, he says. "Assessments are meaningless unless we have specific information keyed to a clearly identified population in a particular area or region."

Carolyn Raymond, staff development director of the Mesa, Ariz., school district, reported that as part of a 1977 needs assessment effort at Mesa, more than 6,000 questionnaires were sent to selected residents. A local newspaper reprinted the questionnaire so that all residents had an opportunity to respond. Even leaders of two Indian tribes living within the district agreed to deliver copies of the questionnaire to residents of their communities. Of the total responses, 95.6% were from persons other than district employes and 90% were full-time residents. Two-thirds had no children enrolled in school, reflecting the makeup of the community. A second needs assessment was conducted to determine inservice development needs of employes.

Raymond believes that it is a mistake to confine a needs assessment to responses from a single questionnaire. "It is important to identify different kinds of needs other than just perceived needs through a questionnaire," she reports. "Needs can be determined through observation, the evaluation process, a literature review while being aware of future trends, and from being informed about court cases," she said. "To many people are relying on a self-report needs assessment instrument as being the only way of identifying needs."

The needs assessment, according to *The Practitioner*, published by the National Assn. of Secondary School Principals, is as simple as finding out the nature of the discrepancy between "where we are and where we want to be." When 'needs' are defined as discrepancy gaps, the needs assessment process . . . enables the principal to see where he/she is going. And, if valid tests are used, it is possible to know exactly how close he/she is to achieving school objectives, said the publication.

Ivan D. Wagner, as director of planning and evaluation for the Indiana Dept. of Public Instruction, rounded up a list of the most popular systems procedures then in use in public school systems. In addition to MBO, PPBS and PPBES, he identified ERMS (Educational Resources Management System), ERAS (Educational Resource Allocation Sys-

tem), MIS (Management Information System), EBO (Education by Objectives), LBO (Leadership by Objectives), CBE (Competency-Based Education), EBR (Education by Results), ROME (Results Oriented Management in Education), MBR (Management by Result) and OD (Organizational Development).

Some of the labels, obviously, are actually re-labeling jobs designed to remove negative connections by disguising older names such as MBO or PPBS. Wagner's study also revealed that "the degree of success in utilizing a management system can be attributed to management (school board and administrators) and not the system being adopted."

One of the newer systems is ZBB (Zero-Based Budgeting) popularized by President Jimmy Carter. ZBB requires a company or agency, in effect, to start all over in the preparation of each budget rather than to add on or subtract from the previous budget.

Each manager is required to prepare a "decision package" for each activity, operation, or function for which he/she has chief responsibility. The package must include a statement which specifies goals, purposes, costs, alternative courses of action, benefits, consequences of not performing the activity and measures of performance. The packages must then be prioritized.

Harry Hartley believes congressmen and other legislators are inclined to misunderstand the concept of ZBB and think that it means "zero-increase" budgeting, which causes them to want to promote it. President Carter introduced a state system while serving as governor of Georgia. But in an article on the subject in the *Harvard Business Review*, James D. Suver and Ray L. Brown reported that 11 of 13 department heads in the Georgia government indicated there had been no apparent reallocation of financial resources in their departments as a result of ZBB.

The requirement for alternative levels of funding rather than a single budget request also has encouraged the use of ZBB, Hartley says. Not only the requested increase but the entire base must be justified. The system, because it forces a complete examination of how money is spent and not just additions to the budget, may attract attention in education.

Some of the parts of ZBB also may be particularly attractive, according to Hartley. These include: (1) the requirement for alternative levels of funding, (2) the decision packages concept and (3) the examination of the base expenditure as well as the increment.

David E. Weischadle, associate professor of education at Montclair (N.J.) State College, warned in an article in the NASSP *Bulletin* that "ZZB is no all-out remedy, particularly as it tries to dislodge incremental budgeting. The practice of adding equal increases

'across-the-board' is both convenient and tradition-bound, although it presents little in the way of rational decision-making."

At the Fairfax County (Va.) School District, ZBB received a trial run. Supt. S. John Davis said in early 1978: "I feel that further development of 'zero-base' budgeting techniques begun last year, together with the rigorous and detailed budget review by area and associate superintendents and myself, was responsible for holding budget increases to a minimum. Our zero-base techniques this year included development of 'decision packages' by non-school-based program managers."

The Tacoma (Wash.) School District has converted ZBB into a rather dramatic citizen participation planning tool for getting approval of necessary financing. It is "building the budget from the bottom up based upon the needs of students, and the intensive involvement of the community," explained Carol Otterson, administrative assistant for budget and data processing planning. It has been given a symbol at Tacoma: B^3U. The school board announced the budget-planning method on the heels of a nine-day teacher strike in 1974. A disputed budget had been a major reason for the strike.

The plan which the board approved called for involvement of more than 1,200 persons as school-lay budget building units at 56 schools and in each central office and division on a total of 90 committees. The task for each group was to begin with the needs of students and to describe in dollar figures the services required to meet the students' needs. A typical committee included four to five teachers, three to four parents and two to three students (in secondary schools).

The committees wanted to spend $74 million; anticipated funds totaled $48 million. A "feasability committee" was named to select a money figure which the members believed citizens were willing to spend. (The figure selected was slightly below one which the superintendent had recommended to the board). During the next three years voters approved special levies, and now other Washington state districts are using the plan.

The Oregon School Administrators warned school managers using ZBB to "expect some opposition from staff, particularly those members whose programs have been accepted without question for years; money will be spent on priority items rather than on tradition."

William Curtis, who has studied ZBB extensively, says that improved managerial effectiveness should result from a proper implementation of ZBB. Its success, however, "is highly dependent upon the broad involvement of people and acceptance of the fact that decision-making is no longer a unilateral process. The broad involvement of people will require extensive staff development."

Chapter 5.

Evaluation: An Essential Step

Some of the changes in school operations during the 1970s were responses to mandates of one type or another. These included court decisions, state and national laws and regulations and guidelines. In some instances, the mandates stemmed from the failure of public school systems to abolish unfair or discriminatory practices. Some of the shortcomings were easily remedied by developing new systems and procedures, while others have defied management solutions and efforts because of their complexities.

A prime example of the latter was the management of student records. These typically were viewed by educators to be the property of schools—created, maintained, used and made available to members of the staff. However, student files also frequently contained inappropriate notes and informal reports by teachers.

A few efforts had been made to warn public school educators about the problem, notably those by the Russell Sage Foundation, which funded major efforts to convey some sense of the hazards of improper student recordkeeping.

The stage was set for Sen. James Buckley, R-N.Y., who authored the "Buckley Amendment" or Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 to govern the preparation and management of student records in elementary and secondary schools and in higher education.

In a somewhat similar fashion, state and national legislation was approved to assure the educational rights of handicapped children. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and comparable state legislation, with accompanying rules and guidelines, clearly spelled out major educational program omissions of many districts. School districts taking part in the federally mandated provisions of the new special education programs found themselves operating a new educational program complete with goals, objectives and specified activities (such as formal campaigns to identify handicapped children and youth not receiving educational services).

The management training for new demands on school administrators has undergone a curious evolution. Although traditional programs in higher education for teaching personnel have generally been applied to administrative and supervisory personnel by school boards and the professional hierarchy, new patterns may be emerging. The doctoral degree has become well-established during the past two decades as an essential requirement for the superintendent and others by most boards of education. It has been difficult to attain for many candidates because universities have insisted they had to be resident students. This raised a barrier which screened out talented administrators for whom doctoral programs were not economically feasible. In many instances, course work was completed over a period of time but candidates who were working administrators could not break away from the demands of their jobs for long enough periods to write their dissertations in compliance with degree requirements.

An even more distressing aspect of the advanced educational work, for both those seeking degrees and those who already possessed them, was that the new knowledge needed most by the administrators was rarely to be found on the campus or in libraries. The significant action was taking place in the field.

For decades the non-profit American Management Assn. has been offering short-term seminars and courses dealing with contemporary problems, practices and innovations. School administrator associations established counterpart programs for educational managers, although significant pioneering work had been conducted at the state level by some school boards associations. Extensive year-round programs now are offered by the National School Boards Assn. and American Assn. of School Administrators.

Today the American Management Assn. also offers short-term programs for school administrators, as well as a number of major universities and a few state education departments. But training, orientation and other aspects of installing an MBO system, for example, may require extensive time and attention that administrators are not prepared to make. Norman Drachler, former Detroit superintendent, found in a survey of inservice training programs in 34 large city school systems only one which an ongoing inservice program for administrators.

Developmental Evaluation

Most salary schedules recognize only degrees and college credits, although increasingly the organizations and associations offering management seminars have found it desirable to offer Continuing Education

Units (CEUs) for hours of seminar work which have been satisfactorily completed. Some organizations have found it relatively easy to make arrangements with a university or college to grant course credits for participation in organization-operated conferences and workshops.

There is great reluctance in educational administration to relate personnel evaluation to developmental needs, perhaps because in the vast majority of school districts evaluation seems never to have evolved beyond the concept of a simple rating approach. In fact, educators commonly view "inservice" only as a type of 'remedial' cure for staff members needing help.

Management development has been a recognized term in schools of business and in key industries for a quarter of a century. Some firms have made the evaluation procedure a principal method for personalizing developmental needs in the organization. There is increasing doubt, in both public and private organizations, that people should be paid salary increases merely for growing older on the job.

Administrators have been said to dislike performance evaluations because of shortcomings similar to those in typical procedures for teacher evaluation: evaluation and observation tend to be equated, checklists of qualities and personality traits are in use, job functions are unclear and vague, evaluators lack evaluation skills, and there really is no organizational need for evaluation.

Developmental evaluation is related directly to one of the major issues confronting contemporary school management. Affirmative action programs to move more women and blacks and other minorities into administrative positions are moving along slowly. A major reason for this is that the programs typically do not enlist the interest or effort of the entire management group in an organization. The absence of management development programs in most school districts serves as a key indicator of management weakness in this area.

In a major state like Pennsylvania, with 504 school superintendents in 1977-78, only one was a female and two were blacks, according to the state department of education. "Clearly our institutions of higher education, responsible for preparing people to be superintendents, could do much more to encourage women and minorities to enroll in and complete the necessary work," declared the department. "Clearly most of Pennsylvania's school boards could do a more effective job of encouraging black and female candidates to apply for their superintendent vacancies and then give those candidates serious consideration."

Bernard W. Kaye, Minneapolis associate superintendent for personnel, suggests that if more women are to go into school administration, locally adopted affirmative action programs must become part of management systems.

Ten Steps Toward Performance Appraisal of the Superintendent

STEP ONE: Break down school district operations into *functions* or *management responsibility* areas. For example: Finance, personnel, educational program, etc.

STEP TWO: Break down each district function into the *tasks* which must be carried out within that area. For example, in the area of "personnel," a task might be "recruitment" or "compensation program."

STEP THREE: For each task, clarify the respective *roles* of the school board, superintendent, and other staff members. Using key action words to analyze roles, for example, it might be determined that the superintendent's role in "compensation programs" is to "direct" or "develop" or "implement," etc.

STEP FOUR: Identify one or more *indicators of effectiveness* for each task which can be used to determine whether the task is being satisfactorily carried out. For example, indicators of effectiveness of the "compensation program" might be "parity with similar districts" or "attract high quality employees" or "reward performance."

STEP FIVE: Prepare a *job description* for the superintendent (or evaluate the existing job description) by combining functions and tasks with roles specified in Step Three. For example: "Implement board policies in directing programs for recruiting, training, compensating, and evaluating all district employees."

STEP SIX: Within each district function, categorize tasks as minimal, reasonable, or special to determine which tasks can be evaluated by *exception* and which by *objectives*.

STEP SEVEN: Determine which tasks call for written objectives either because they are *minimal* expectations which represent problems or reasonable expectations deemed important or *special* expectations which can be started but not completed.

STEP EIGHT: Combine the district function, the specific task, the role of the superintendent, the indicator of effectiveness for the task, and the reasonable expectations of the board in writing an objective.

STEP NINE: Agree upon an expected outcome for each objective—the evidence upon which the superintendent's evaluation will be based. What will the board and superintendent look for to determine when the objective has been met? In the following example, the expected outcome is italicized:

> Update school board policies in accordance with recent civil rights legislation, as evidenced by *a written analysis of each personnel policy, accompanied by proposed policy changes, submitted for board review and approval by July 1, 1980.*

STEP TEN: Rank objectives in order of priority.

A Superintendent Appraisal System.

Copyright 1978
Reprinted by permission of the Illinois School Boards Association.

Such a management system would include objectives like these:

1. Aggressive recruitment programs to get women candidates for administrative positions.
2. Addition of more women to screening committees.
3. Program of inservice development workshops to enable women to explore career options and examine ways to enter and maintain leadership positions.
4. Development of part-time opportunities to enable women to remain in the field while raising children.
5. Holding of male awareness sessions dealing with attitudes and practices which perpetuate discrimination.
6. Pressuring universities to encourage more women candidates for administrative positions.

Energy Shortage—Forcing Change

The mandate thrust upon school boards and administrators to respond to the energy shortage (with considerably more speed than Congress and the federal administration) amounted to a mandate to management to take action in some systematic way. There were enough emergency closings because of adverse weather conditions to suggest what could happen on a larger scale.

Possibly it was the emergency condition or the fact that most employes in some school districts realized success was dependent upon their participation in a plan of action. The saving of energy, district administrators learned, went far beyond turning down thermostats, reviewing bus routes and extracurricular activities. Educators began to realize that schools, as major users of energy in most communities, would face a doubling of energy costs in three to four years. A national survey of school administrators made in 1977 showed, however, that only 36% saw energy as being a "critical" problem for their school districts.

"Increased fuel costs will dig into school budgets," predicted the American Assn. of School Administrators, following a study of the conditions which will face school management. "As a result, other items in the budget will have to be cut. Likely candidates are salaries, supplies and equipment."

"Unless energy sources are conserved now," said G. Robert Bowers, head of the Energy Assistance Office, Ohio Dept. of Education, "American technology probably will not have the time and capability to develop new energy sources nor the opportunity to make transitions to new lifestyles without traumatic social and economic disturbances."

Chapter 6.

Personnel

The greatest need of school boards and administrators has been to improve personnel relationships. Even though school personnel costs constitute 80% or more of school operating costs and represent the true assets of a school district, more school district managers have done little to formally identify and capitalize on staff talents.

Talent is measured and recognized for salary purposes in terms of satisfactory completion of university courses and longevity on the job. Salaries are seldom related to any basis of quality performance. Dismissal is usually not possible for mediocre work. Job descriptions, if they exist at all, are generalized and may apply to an entire group of employes rather than individuals. Although the school organization may contribute to the expenses of an employe who makes a personal decision to seek skill improvement by granting a sabbatical leave, there ordinarily is no other involvement by the organization except in token ways.

With the coming of teacher unionization, management has been forced by collective bargaining to account for every minute of assigned on-the-job time of teachers. Ideally, as new practices are introduced, there would be built-in provisions for required inservice training and orientations. Education, particularly, offers a challenge to cooperative management-employe activities on personnel development. Yet, inservice training, under a Carter Administration-backed Teacher Center Law, passed by Congress in 1977, takes a curious twist. Although supposedly addressed to the inservice requirements of teachers, with final responsibility to be assumed by boards of education, the inservice program is under the direction of a majority of teachers on the policy board. Initial funding of the federal law was too inadequate to permit a general adoption of teacher centers with districts initially selected on the basis of applications submitted to the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare.

Inservice development of management personnel was not provided for under the Teacher Center Law, but was promised support by HEW officials.

Teachers, Administrators Drift Apart

Until teacher associations rapidly converted to unionism in the 1960s and 1970s, school administrators played a vital role in the organizations. Member dues for state and national organizations were collected locally with the cooperation and assistance of management personnel. Memberships were encouraged by administrators, virtually all of whom had been members of NEA and its state units. Some teacher groups continue to allow administrators to maintain memberships and obtain insurance and other services.

This long history of close identification by administrators with teaching and NEA affiliates may explain why formal recognition elections for the purpose of selecting employe collective bargaining agents have been unopposed. A management campaign urging a district employe group not to select a national group as a bargaining agent thus far has been a rarity. At Clovis, Calif., the school district board and management did inform teachers and other employes of the right to vote for no representation. The result was that the teachers voted not to be represented either by AFT or NEA, as did office employes. Clovis school officials were pleased and surprised. Management letters were relied upon heavily to inform employes. The message also was carried by a group of teachers formed after learning it was not obligatory to vote for a national organization to represent them. Teachers also learned that they could maintain their memberships in national organizations without necessarily being represented by them as collective bargaining agents.

Special Techniques for Schools

Public school management has been slow to recognize the special handicaps they face in maintaining good employe relations. Administrators, having been teachers, frequently tend to see themselves as having adequate information about teacher interests, concerns and need. Communication with teachers and other employes tends to be very much like it was prior to unionization. Employe publications, for example, tend to be published infrequently on shoestring budgets as compared to elaborate employe publications found in other fields. With employes engaged in specialized work and possibly isolated much of the time from colleagues, there is logic for school systems to establish sound systems of management communication with employes. And the unionization of employes has made the rationale clearer.

One of the fixtures of the private sector for more than 35 years has been the employe suggestion system. Aside from its value as a source of

ideas, the suggestion box serves as a constant visual reminder to employes that there is a standing management invitation to receive employe suggestions and ideas. Although several school districts have attempted suggestion systems, this medium of communication probably exists in only a handful of school districts today.

There have been some successful attempts to reduce the communication opportunities of management through collective bargaining, but most of the delinquencies in effective employe communication are due to weak practices of school boards and administrators, and a lack of understanding of the part played by good communication in employe relationships.

At Tacoma, Wash., where the *Staff Bulletin* is published every Friday, there may be "extras" editions in times of management needs. When contract negotiations proceed beyond the school year, issues of the *Staff Bulletin* are mailed directly to employes' homes. When one issue of the publication included a great deal of information setting forth the financial condition of the school district, extra copies were mailed to community organizations and leaders. Another important role of the publication is to report summaries of question-and-answer sessions conducted monthly where elected representatives of employes ask questions important to them. At Spokane, Wash., the employe publication produced special editions to explain the major provisions arrived at in a new contract.

Performance Evaluations

Some school systems are adopting employe evaluation programs which also serve as a main management-employe link. Substituted for the traditional rating schemes involving checklists and other "canned" approaches to evaluation, a new "developmental" evaluation has been gaining interest and adoption in several fields for the past two decades.

Known most widely as "performance evaluation," the method tries to bring about on-the-job improvement by enlisting the person performing the work in a partnership-type relationship with his/her supervisor. The procedure assumes that the person being evaluated derives self-satisfaction from performing the job well and, ordinarily, is in a better position than anyone else to improve the job best. He/she is encouraged to initiate job improvement objectives and to identify the criteria to measure the nature and amount of progress being made toward the achievement of the objectives. The evaluator becomes an advisor and "partner." Performance data is shared and interview results are studied. Frequent communication is a mandatory component.

"School administrators should seize the initiative and not let golden opportunities go by," observes George B. Redfern, retired associate executive director of the AASA and a leading proponent of performance evaluation in public education. He believes that performance evaluation contrasts so sharply with conventional evaluations that it has aroused a great deal of interest recently. "It is much more desirable as a means of improving performance than merely providing an end-of-the-year 'report card,'" says Redfern. There is much talk about improving performance but few concepts present themselves for this purpose in such an acceptable fashion to everyone, he says.

There is still a great deal of apprehension about evaluation and resistance on the part of teacher organizations, according to Redfern. He predicts that teacher organizations will attempt to use collective bargaining to build into master agreements constraints on the evaluation process. Legislatures and state education agencies, however, will continue to mandate evaluation. There will continue to be a great interest in reviewing existing evaluation arrangements. It will be difficult to wean educators away from traditional methods, he predicts, and the movement for "evaluation by objectives" will continue at a slow pace.

But the big handicaps are inadequate implementation of programs and failure to make new evaluation programs a cooperative venture. Some school board members and administrators who are less interested in staff improvement than "getting rid of dead wood" will see the latter as the main purpose of evaluation, he said.

"The question is: 'What will educators do with these opportunities?'" said Redfern. "If they are used to design promising new approaches to the process, there will be many benefits. If they are used merely to retread old procedures by patchwork and cosmetic applications, golden opportunities will have been lost."

The similarity between programs of managing by objectives or results and performance evaluation is striking: participants are goal-and-objective oriented, performance reviews are for the purpose of studying results in order to bring about improvement, and there is the belief that effective communication is essential to success.

Chapter 7.

School/Community Relations

The public schools in the late 1970s appeared to be heading into a new and difficult era. The decade had been a tumultous one. The public discovered that, contrary to the American myth, schools could not actually accomplish every task asked of them. Schools were seized upon as a major instrument of national policy by the federal government. The task of achieving national goals—such as racial integration, raising minimum nutrition and health levels—was given to the schools along with earmarked money. More and better scientists were needed to compete with Soviet scientists; therefore, Congress created the National Defense Education Act. Federal funds were sent to school districts to beef up science and math education. Congress took the approach that the nation could solve other problems by giving the schools money for specified purposes. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, money was supplied through Title I to improve instruction for economically disadvantaged children. It was the beginning of a "war on poverty." There were many other titles and money designed to accomplish other purposes. Schools were said not to be sufficiently creative. Hence, Title III was used to motivate the adoption of innovations in schools.

In all of this, including similar programs enacted by some state legislatures, there was an assumption that the public schools not only would be successful but would, in addition, eventually take over the permanent financing of the new initiatives. But the responsibilities thrust on schools were great and usually underfinanced.

Another dramatic change occurred when schools turned abruptly from a growth industry to a declining one. Enrollments had risen steadily for two decades. School boards in many sections of the country had devoted hours of deliberations to the selection of the best future building sites in outer areas to be prepared for the continuing stream of school children. Now there were surplus sites and empty classrooms. Although the post-World War II generation had been the nation's largest

and had the greatest potential for producing the spectacular population surge, this was stopped by birth control methods and changing societal values. There was disbelief everywhere. The universities continued to turn out new teachers and administrators as though nothing was happening. Elaborate school district recruiting programs came to a sudden halt.

Declining enrollments had so many internal and public aspects that this came to be regarded as a critical problem involving special administrator skills. The administrator claim that it would cost more to teach fewer students resulted in public disbelief and loss of administrator and school board credibility. The fact that enrollments declined unevenly so far as grade levels and neighborhoods were concerned made little impression upon taxpayers, especially when they had no children enrolled in schools.

School boards and administrators had never developed very sophisticated views about the nature of public school support. The "public" in the minds of many educators was parents, especially those who came to PTA meetings and visited the schools. Dale Mann of Columbia U., who was involved in a study dealing with the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, arranged for interviews with a sample of 165 administrators in 10 areas of New York state. When asked about the nature of their jobs, 55% mentioned parents or the community in their description. Only one-third gave recognition to nonparents as important to the school community, and students were not even mentioned. Mann said the administrators concentrated their attention upon those who already were school supporters, and about one-half denied or failed to mention that their communities included nonsupporters of the public schools.

Taking the Pulse

Until the late 1960s, attitudes about public schools were not believed to be sufficiently significant to warrant a national public opinion poll. Schools had been involved in a few national polls, however, which were not conducted for the primary purpose of discerning opinion about schools. One example is the poll conducted for the television industry by the Roper Organization, Inc., which has been in progress annually since 1959. The Charles F. Kettering Foundation arranged to launch the first annual poll about public education in 1969, conducted by the Gallup Poll.

The Gallup Poll of Public Education was not the first to provide a tip that schools faced declining favorable public opinion. This showed up in the Roper Organization Poll in 1959 when only 64% of the public

said schools were doing a good job. The percentage continued to drop in each subsequent biennial poll through 1976. The Gallup Poll, which has input from a panel of leading educators, has sought less direct response about the value of schools than has been the case in some other polls. A regional poll by Field Research Corp. in 1973 asked Californians about their degree of confidence in various professions and agencies. Research scientists ranked in first place followed by local police and the medical profession. The public schools ranked 14th.

At Eagle Rock, Ore., where voters defeated five successive school levies and the community was bitterly divided over financing of the schools, the board was finally persuaded to take an opinion poll. What was bothering taxpayers? The poll showed that taxpayers thought property taxes and school costs were too high and that the school board and staff lacked public confidence. They criticized the quality of the high school program, and too little emphasis on the basics. The Eagle Rock board took corrective steps; the next budget proposal received a four-to-one favorable response from the voters.

"Our credibility would take care of itself if we'd just ask ourselves three things," an Oregon administrator told an education writer for the *American School Board Journal*. "We need to ask: What are we doing? Why are we doing it? And what difference does it make? When we can answer those questions for the community, we won't have any further problems with credibility or community support."

Too few school boards and top administrators insist that a school district not only has a right but a duty to keep citizens fully informed about school issues and affairs which will affect them. The Los Angeles school board, after sending out materials which told how a proposed ballot issue would adversely affect the schools, was hauled into court by a group which attempted to prohibit the distribution of the information by the board.

Said Superior Court Judge George M. Dell in ruling against the complaining group:

> As long as what is disseminated is material limited to what the effect of the possible decrease in financing will have upon the school board, I think it's not only appropriate but is actually the duty of the respondents in this case. To the extent it goes beyond that and constitutes actual campaigning, counsel for the plaintiff are free to come in and seek relief. But I don't see any likelihood that's going to take place. I don't think that the plaintiffs have justified the relief they seek in this case. . . .

A special commission of the Pennsylvania School Boards Assn., instructed to identify and recommend ways that local school officials

could strengthen local control over education in 1975, made these recommendations:

- Each school board should use various information media to communicate to the general public the role and function of locally elected school board members.

- Each school district should include in the high school curriculum a course on the development of public education, with special attention given to the roles, duties and responsibilities of the school board member.

- The school board should regularly objectively evaluate its procedures, managerial effectiveness and school-community relations.

- The board, when appropriate, should form citizen advisory groups to increase public awareness and involvement in the governance of public education.

- School districts should use a systematic method of assessing community needs and opinions on public education matters, using the information as the basis for policy determination.

- School boards, with the superintendent, should annually set specific objectives representing board direction for the administration and staff. Administrators should then be held accountable for performance related to specific accomplishments in these areas.

- School boards should recognize their role as the public's advocate in employing and overseeing the professional staff to meet the educational needs of the community.

Although there have been spectacular achievements by schools and school districts through the use of advisory committees, in some districts all kinds of techniques have been developed to frustrate and to discourage advisory groups. According to critics the chief offenses are:

1. Failure to give committees clearcut assignments which they can reasonably carry out;

2. Failure to provide adequate briefing, time for work, encouragement and thanks

3. Too much condescending and talking down to concerned people.

Supt. Donald Thomas of Salt Lake City says "public confidence is strongly related to participation in school governance" and that this may well be the key to the future of public education support. Shared governance, improvements in school achievement and accountability programs already are working for the building of greater public confidence, he says. He sees increased confidence ahead with greater involvement in school affairs by parents, particularly, and the emergence of effective evaluation programs, he comments.

If there are some school doors open to the public and some closed, there can be strong public reactions. Teacher organizations and most professional negotiators, for example, prefer to have all collective bargaining sessions held in strict privacy. A few states have enacted legislation requiring disclosure of union and school board demands prior to the start of negotiations. And in many instances, schools managements have cooperated with unions in giving very limited publicity to the bargaining issues.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has obtained a federal grant to:

1. Finance a national program to familiarize PTA members with collective bargaining processes;

2. Set up the PTA as a child advocate in collective bargaining;

3. Assume the role of leadership in discussing collective bargaining issues at public forums.

PTA leaders have been advised that each clause of a contract should be reviewed to determine its impact upon children. The organization has circulated to leaders a *Child Advocate's Guide to Collective Bargaining in Education*. And the national organization has asked that collective bargaining be made a matter of discussion at local meetings.

William Pharis, executive director of the National Assn. of Elementary School Principals, underlines the importance of parent involvement in school affairs but stresses the necessity of approaching the idea with something more than just enthusiasm. "All too often, we find that what we really wanted was parent approval of decisions we had already made," he observed in a message to the group's members. "We were seeking ratification, not initiation. If we want parent involvement in the decision-making process, and I believe that we should, then we have to stop playing games and mixing our values. There must be a systematic program for making it happen. Involvement cannot be achieved through a monthly PTA meeting, although that organization can be an excellent structure to build on."

He points out that at least one national parent group is ready to take legal and other actions to force responses from educators who take evasive actions in failing to make public the records and other business of schools. There are others, including the PTA, which increasingly warn that there are limits to its generally cooperative stance.

Don Davies, executive director of the Institute for Responsive Education, declares that "schools are too often closed systems, walled off from their communities, their parents, and even their students." Says Davies, "The primary argument of those who advocate citizen participation in educational decision making is that the professionals are too concerned about protecting their own territory."

It is fairly obvious that there is a growing "consumerism" movement in education. The National Committee for Citizens in Education is said to be an adaptation of national public interest groups. Sporadic legal actions have been taken on the claim that individuals have failed to receive an adequate education from the public schools. A substantial amount of the critical writings by child advocates is directed at the conduct or professional shortcomings of public school educators. School supporters today face communities which are completely different from only a few years ago. A decade or two ago much of the support for public education came from the large percentage of voting adults who had close school ties. But the classic make-up of the population, both urban and rural, has undergone drastic alterations during the past two decades. Much of this has been due to political and economic change. The conversion of agriculture to a highly sophisticated, industrialized "agribusiness" has completed altered rural America. Lack of jobs and welfare policies radically change the make-up of the big cities. The number of one-parent families has greatly increased.

Communications also underwent a revolution. Those who complained that TV generation children did not learn to read and write adequately in school were the same adults who themselves relied increasingly upon television for news, entertainment, and guidance for shopping and lifestyle ideas.

The great economic, social, political and geographic changes of the past quarter century had their indirect impacts also. A favorite bit of advice to school officials in the 1950s and 1960s was to gain the approval and support of the community "power structure" in order to win public approval and consent at the polls or in other ways. However, those who had responsibility to contact the "power structure" found that decision-making, in many ways, had moved away and become decentralized. Many banks, newspapers, radio and TV stations, stores, and gas stations had become chain-owned. Many decisions, formerly made by local owners and managers, could no longer be made locally.

Neither was community organization help as easy to come by as in years past. Organization and institutional decision-making was at a remote division headquarters and local managers, in many cases, were not really "neighbors" but transients.

School districts which went to the voters learned by the late 1970s of the profound changes which were taking place. In 1976, the Fairfax County, Va., schools, after suffering three bond referendum defeats in four tries, decided that it might be a better strategy to seek out new voters rather than to try to convert the negative traditional voters. A special registration campaign produced more than 8,000 newly registered voters. Principals, for the first time, were given direct responsibility to inform voters in their communities. The result: "yes" vote totaled more than 70%.

But how many school board members and administrators have failed to detect that radically different community attitudes—and communities themselves—now prevail? "I still put a great deal of blame for failure with boards and superintendents," said school campaign expert Bill Banach of Mt. Clemens, Mich. "There are still numerous cases where there is a casual attitude toward campaigns. The effort is approached with a 'well, we're going to have an election' attitude. We talked about the property tax burden 10 years ago and today the burden is considerably worse. People are saying 'I've had it' by voting against school issues. Today there is an absence of strong political signals from school leadership. The community needs to know where the administration and board stand on an issue. In too many cases, the firm position or strong signal does not exist. In fact, many of these districts are characterized by the way they turn the entire campaign responsibility over to citizens."

If there is an area in which school boards, generally, have demonstrated a helplessness, it is in effective communication with the staff and parents, and with the many publics the schools must serve. This is also an area where boards have had little or no guidance or counsel from school management. "Success at the polls in the future," said Banach, "will be directly related to the quality of the ongoing school communication/community relations program in the district. People simply don't understand us anymore."

A problem not so obvious is that too many administrators have not given effective school district communication a high priority even though school districts often use more tax money and have bigger payrolls than any other organization in the community.

Some taxpayers organizations are becoming more overt in fighting school issues. At Fairfax County, Va., where schools have greatly strengthened their campaigning capability, the Fairfax County Tax-

payers Alliance, which has opposed all bond issues for many years, went to court in 1977 to block the distribution of informational brochures about a bond issue proposal on the ballot.

Judge Richard J. Jamborsky, of the 19th Judicial Circuit Court, responded to the Taxpayers Alliance, setting the record straight so far as school board and other public agency obligations are concerned:

> If citizens believe that the reason for school construction or renovation are invalid, or that bond financing is undesirable, any statement from the school board contrary to that opinion may appear 'biased' or 'partisan.' A public agency proposing a bond referendum should communicate its reasons and justifications for it to the voters. The public agency may be derelict if it does not. Voters may then pass on the wisdom of the agency's action.

Where an Expert Is Needed

The fact that many school districts operate without benefit of professional assistance for communication and public information is a mark of inadequate management. School boards demonstrated that money was available if the need was recognized when they began to hire collective bargaining specialists and advisors.

"Many, and perhaps most, boards of education and superintendents don't understand the role of the communication specialist in the administrative organization," said Harold Van Winkle, professor of educational administration and journalism at Kent State U. "Very little has happened in the development and use of school communication specialists" during the past 25 years, according to Van Winkle. He cited a study made by L. J. Stiles of Northwestern U. published under the title, *The Present State of Neglect*, which disclosed how education and journalism graduate school programs had ignored the needs for communication specialists in school districts.

"There is no known evidence that the situation has improved materially in the years since the study was made," said Van Winkle in an article in the Ohio School Boards Assn. *Journal*. He also pointed to an obstacle which professional educators had raised (indirectly) to prohibit the employment of professional communicators as part of the district staff. One of the requirements in Ohio, he said, was that a school and community relations specialist needed 27 months of classroom teaching experience in order to qualify for a special certificate. One newspaper writer, tongue in cheek, commented this line of reasoning would make it rough if required of writers and editors in the liquor industry.

The Coming of the School Volunteer

One breakthrough in school-community relationships was the coming of volunteers. Teachers yielded to the idea of teacher aides which was encouraged in federally sponsored programs, rather reluctantly, but volunteers were accepted more easily. They offered no threats to job security or status.

Early in the 1970s it was estimated that more than 2 million volunteers were on the job in the nation's schools. Total man-hours of work given to the schools will never be known. At Oklahoma City, Okla., 832 volunteers gave 24,180 hours of help to more than 16,000 students. The Los Angeles schools volunteer program had 8,500 tutors in a volunteer program in 1971. Their services were estimated to have a cash value of $100,000 per week. By 1977, there were more than 20,000 volunteers in the Los Angeles program. The contribution to Dallas, Tex., schools by 6,000 volunteers was estimated at a cash value of $500,000 (using a minimum wage rate). In addition to parents, high school and college students constituted other major volunteer groups in school districts. And the large numbers of older persons scheduled to retire in the future suggests a vast manpower pool of help for schools, much of it at little or no cost, if school officials want to seek it out.

Chapter 8.

School Organization

Of all the changes in educational organization during the past two decades, the alternative school may come to be looked upon as one of the most significant of all. Unfortunately "alternative school" has many meanings. In some cases, parents insisted that the school be established because conventional schools couldn't meet the needs of all. As a Wisconsin school board member said at national school boards convention: "Realistically, all students do not come to school well-equipped to take advantage of the educational opportunities provided by the school. All students of high school age have not developed inner controls, and some youngsters require more outer controls than do others."

"We confuse the public in our terminology," declared principal Alan J. Guma, head of an alternative school at New Orleans. "We call programs designed to deal with drop-outs and disruptive students 'alternatives' when, in fact, they are more properly 'special function' schools, not optional or alternative schools. In some cases the parent or student may not have chosen the school. When we do create a genuine optional school we learn that our parents are not willing to send their children to them because in their minds all alternative schools are for 'problem' children," he said.

In the case of Guma's school, the objective was to help integration through the use of magnet schools, each with a special attraction not found in conventional schools. "Until we use language with precision, we cannot expect understanding and support," he said. "A related problem is that when these new programs are created, people within the school district—assistant superintendents, principals and teachers—are not told what will be the mission of these schools."

Guma said the objective was to prevent a further exodus of white and black middle class families from the schools and to attract back to the public schools families which had deserted them.

"That mission was both simply stated and widely misunderstood," he said. "In the eyes of many of my peers in the principal ranks, our

school and others like it were creaming off the top talent from within the public schools and simply regrouping it. Time was not taken in the beginning to explain the mission of these schools."

Alternative schools also got entangled with the earlier so-called "free schools," which, to many, had fuzzy objectives. Some alternative schools, however, were far more disciplined than many conventional schools in terms of pursuing clearcut goals and objectives. Guma says his personal view was that the most important single reason for the alternative school was to show voucher system advocates and non-public school fans that there was, within the public sector, a new system of options.

Alternative schools have special management problems, said Guma. One of these is that federal or private foundation money may be involved and eventually runs out. "It is at this point that many alternative programs perish," he explained. A related problem is that staff members of regular schools in the district become concerned that their schools do not receive special funding also.

"If optional programs have merit—and I clearly believe that they do—then they must be built into the regular operational budget of the school district to guarantee them security and legitimacy," he said.

Staffing is a special problem with alternative schools. "In some districts, alternative schools have been staffed by people whose only reason for seeking the assignment is that there are no other jobs available," said Guma. In too many instances, reported the principal of a West Coast alternative high school, this is true of school principals, too. The California "continuation" high schools in many instances, are viewed to be for those who haven't made it in conventional schools, including students, staff and management.

Alternative schools, of course, are not only for those who have been unsuccessful in conventional schools. School districts have also responded to parents' demands for back-to-basics education in elementary schools. What the parents seek are "fundamental" schools which stress dress codes, the teacher as a central authority, formal classroom order and the teaching of patriotic forms. And several school districts have established "alternatives" which answer these demands.

Almost overlooked entirely in many of the districts having alternative schools, according to administrators, has been the need for staff development programs. These needs are in addition to requirements for special talents and a willingness to work extra hours.

"It is an all too common experience for alternative schools to be created without any consideration being given to provide staff training and support," confirmed Guma. "Administrators and teachers in these programs are somehow supposed to blunder through to success."

Meanwhile, he said, those in the central office who may have neglected inservice development requirements, seek to evaluate results almost immediately. "Alternative programs should not necessarily be judged by exactly the same criteria as all other programs, nor should they be expected to achieve perfection," commented Guma, noting that this has not been the case with conventional schools.

Choice at the Secondary Level

In many metropolitan school districts there have been specialized high schools for many years, offering general vocational programs and even greater specialization in automative, mechanical, theatrical and science areas. The idea of creating "magnet" high schools dedicated to special programs in various vocations, science or the arts as a means of stimulating voluntary desegregation in some cities gave integration planners an important stake in alternative schools. Some well-supported, well-publicized school programs almost immediately reached enrollment capacities.

William D. Jennings of Bellevue, Wash., who has been head of the "off-campus school" in that district and of the Washington Assn. of Learning Alternatives, has identified 170 different secondary school alternative programs in the state of Washington. He said the essential ingredients for starting programs seemed to be:

1. The dangling of "a carrot of federal money" before the eyes of traditionalists.

2. Mounting community concerns about non-productive alienated youth.

3. A corps of restless educators in school districts who felt their talents were being wasted and wanted a new challenge.

He termed elementary alternative schools "the offspring of disenchantment with the traditional school" in an article written for the Journal of the Washington State School Directors Assn.

Loss of state funds, said Bruce Jackson, program manager of "The Thurston Alternative," at North Thurston High School, Lacey, Wash., was the incentive for interest in alternative programs there. This was due to a heavy dropout rate. "Even though this showed a cynical viewpoint, it is precisely what has caused our district to hire one person for each of our two high schools to create dropout prevention programs," said

Jackson. When an alternative program is operated within a regular school, he said, the major emphasis should be upon getting an improved classroom atmosphere schoolwide. "But," he said, "this takes guts because most teachers are satisfied with their programs and don't care to question their curriculum, techniques or attitudes."

In some school districts, decisions to be innovative about secondary school organization were geared more to enrollment shifts or other changes than educational theory.

Adams High School in Portland, Ore., was known as an innovative secondary school when it opened in 1969. However, several of the major organizational changes which it underwent in a five-year period had to do with other factors. By 1974, Adams was switching to eight "schools within a school." This development, coming after living with "houses," "teams," and "agencies," was really motivated by a sharp decline in enrollment. The latter was due to the failure of the school to attract its potential feeder students. Principal Donald Holt said that the school was unable to "clearly articulate to our public precisely what it is we stand for and represent at Adams." The eight-schools-in-one included two college prep schools, two comprehensive studies schools, a career exploration school, a college exploration school, a careers preparation school and an extended-day completion school.

Richard Heitholt, principal of Quincy (Ill.) High School II, one of two separate schools on the same campus, sees much pulling and tugging over the control of schools within schools. The early pilot schools generally seemed to be successful, coinciding with an innovative era in education. On the other hand the alternative schools had an identity problem. Added to the decreasing standardized test scores, financial woes and the back-to-basics movement, the schools have suffered from a slow growth.

Heitholt is optimistic, however, "I think we'll see schools-within-a-school grow and become an integral part of almost every school eventually," he said. "We're going to have to have a few tough years, however."

Carving Out the Middle School

Dissatisfaction with the junior high school drift toward becoming an imitation of the senior high school caused some to speculate that the junior high school years should be used in a more constructive fashion for the group of youngsters in grades six through eight (and with some consideration given to those in fifth and ninth grades, too).

The demand for a smoother transition from the elementary grades

to high school, however, was helped in many sections of the country where the school population was growing rapidly. More classroom space was needed badly for the junior high school grades. At the same time, in many school districts, there was little or no space pressure in senior high schools. This was an excellent opportunity to be "progressive." Ninth grades were shifted to senior high schools. Sixth grades were moved to the junior high school to be combined with the seventh and eighth grades under the new label "middle school."

Middle school proponents contend that the major plus factors actually are philosophical. Teachers are viewed to be competent counselors as well as subject matter teachers. Conventional extracurricular activities may be integrated into the curriculum. Flexible scheduling, the promotion of independent study, and the championship of good teacher-student relationships typically are cultivated features of the middle school. The middle school gained momentum in the mid 1970s and appears to be a lasting organizational form in many school districts.

. . . And Early Childhood Programs

A similar push for "early childhood education" put in its appearance about the same time. The ever-increasing demand for day care facilities, including educational services, reflects the expansion of the women's work force, which has been stimulated by inflation, expanding job opportunities under the women's rights movement, and other developments which have facilitated career jobs for women with young families. There is also the belief among families that day care or early childhood education (ECE) facilities managed by the public schools could be supplied at no cost and with greater certainty and quality than many of the commercial or non-profit facilities which have developed.

There is powerful support for ECE as a means of economic and sociological advancement for children in low income families. California's State Supt. Wilson Riles has widely championed the redesign of lower grades, kindergarten through the third grade, to stimulate earlier intellectual growth and maturity in students.

However, there are other opinions. Helen M. Gilles, physician and member of the Lawrence, Kan., school board, said at a session of the National School Boards Assn. convention that "if we start compulsory education at age three, we are turning increasing responsibility for child rearing and caring over to the public schools, thereby weakening the already-threatened family structure."

This concern reflects a similar belief that government is pursuing a fallacious course in attempting to take over further responsibilities from

families. "Increasingly the schools have taken on responsibilities that used to be functions of the home—health immunizations, dental checks, hearing checks and physical examinations," said Gilles. "Other institutions are taking over home functions as well." Instead, she would like to see the public schools offer programs to strengthen the family. "Included in such programs would be child care and child development courses, marriage and family courses, and interpersonal relationship courses taught in our junior and senior high schools. I see the family as the important element in our society, and would like to see us work for its preservation," she said.

Gilles also questioned the validity of early learning. "I have a feeling that some of our children with learning disabilities are not really learning disabled children," she said. "They may be really immature children who are not ready to learn educational skills that are being thrust upon them. I think that by using a public school system approach to three- and four-year-olds we might increase the number of learning disabled children over the ones we have now. As we do not expect all children to walk at a certain age, so I believe we should not expect all children to read at a certain age."

Evelyn M. Burry, Middletown, Conn., school board member, pointed out at the same session that it would be "ideal" for each child to be in a family setting most of the time, "either in his own home or in a family day care home with half-day group experiences in a quality center" but that such an outlook is not always possible. By the mid-1970s she said, 34.4% of all married women, with children under age six and living with their husbands, were working wives. Among widows, divorcees and women separated from their husbands and having preschool age children, 54% were working.

A Quiet Revolution – Out in the Regions

One of the comparatively quiet revolutions which is taking place, much of it during the past two decades, has been the creation of area service districts to serve multi-school districts, or the conversion of former county offices of superintendents for this purpose.

One way that school districts could remain fairly small and still have available the advantages of larger districts in metropolitan areas was to band together. The transformation is still taking place in many areas. Some school districts are very isolated. Others would prefer to isolate themselves. But most district managements have formed cooperative ventures to obtain management and other services which would otherwise be difficult to come by. The "intermediate" district,

which included many transformed county schools superintendent offices, has come into being to make possible cooperative services to member districts. One of the immediate reactions has been that larger districts, too, found that the intermediate district offered desired services which they wanted to share.

Along with data processing, testing, film libraries, consultant and evaluation services and cooperative purchasing, the districts found that the intermediate district could also carry out instructional programs, including special and vocational education, and inservice training.

There are other patterns of inter-agency action and cooperation. Some include cooperative multi-county ventures and county districts serving as pilot operations in state-sponsored ventures. In some instances, inter-county and county services are linked up with a state university. A veteran of the development of the service districts in New York state believes that the districts can be used for programs for vocational and handicapped students, continuing adult education and special purpose instruction with short term requirements.

Another development began to gather momentum as enrollments declined in the 1970s and citizens found they were paying a high price for empty or sparsely occupied school space. This was the move to community schools. In his book, *Community/Schools and Interagency Programs*, Joseph Ringers Jr., assistant superintendent at the Arlington, Va., schools, points out countless possibilities for making good use of extra school space and, at the same time, improving the school climate for students, the community and taxpayers. He concludes that, although the school may be the largest public structure in the community and the largest tax eater, the school day covers only one-third of the clock, the school year is only one-half of the annual calendar and school pupils constitute only about 20% of the population.

With careful planning and not much added money, a school can make itself into a community facility and deliver a composite of community services to a broad range of citizens over a bigger time period, he said. Although Congress has enacted the Community Schools Act (PL 93-380), neither state governments nor school officials have moved in this direction to much extent.

In the absence of initiative on the part of school administrators and school boards, plus inaction by other local government representatives, Ringers sees federal legislation addressing itself to the use of surplus school space "as a base for combining human service delivery systems." He foresees there will be state assistance for this kind of community education, too, but the mandating of shared space and services will not come until later.

Ringers sees wisdom in the idea of school districts seeking out

"partners" among other government and civic agencies at this point rather than waiting until less desirable choices present themselves.

Who might want to share space in a school building?

Public libraries are most compatible, Ringers points out. The same is true of government departments of human resources, health, social services, environmental health, and community action programs; family service and counseling centers; preschool programs; recreation and leisure time community centers; meeting rooms, informal use of shops, arts centers, lecture halls and performing arts centers.

Year-Round Schools: Moving Up or Out?

A long talked-about change in public school operation appeared to get a new lease on life during the 1960s and the 1970s: year-round schools (YRS).

As Morris A. Shepard and Keith Baker discovered and reported in *Year-Round Schools*, YRS is "rather like a hybrid corn" because it flourishes in some places but not others and is not an educational panacea. There are too many issues which remain unstudied, they reported.

One million students were attending some form of year-round school in 1976, according to Shepard and Keith. They found that continuous school was not exactly a new idea. In some of the major cities during the 1800s, where children were not needed for summer work on the farm, school simply continued. Some school years exceeded 48 weeks (Buffalo was tops with 260 days). But aside from various trials after World War II with extended years and trimesters, the spread of YRS, even for experimental purposes, did not take place until the 1960s. Historically, YRS got attention only when there was a huge influx of new students or a teacher shortage. The basic idea was to avoid or postpone the construction of new building facilities.

In addition to trimesters, there are four quarter plans and even quinmester years. The "45-15" plan calls for four groups each to attend 45 days and then have a 15-day vacation. In theory, at least, this enables a school to accommodate an increase of 33% in enrollment. The "Concept 6" school year is divided into six terms of about 43 days each. A student attends four of the six terms. Then there is the "Flexible Year-Round" school at which a student can begin the year at any time, making up his own attendance pattern and vacation plan.

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

TEACHER'S NAME _____ Number of Observations _____

Social Security No. _____ Total time of Observations _____

Date _____ Was there a pre-conference? _____

Assignment _____ post-conference? _____

School _____ Employee Status: __Probationary
__Tenure

INSTRUCTIONS

It is essential that the teacher and evaluator be familiar with the "Process" booklet, *Evaluation*, and the State bulletin on *Standards of Competent and Ethical Professional Performance*.

HOW TO EVALUATE PERFORMANCE.....

- The principal should indicate whether the teacher meets minimum standards in each of the eight major performance sections. This judgment is to be based upon a review of each of the practices listed within a section. Performance may be regarded as meeting minimum standards even if mild deficiencies exist in every practice in the section. Conversely, a single practice, if seriously deficient, can result in an unsatisfactory rating for the entire section.

- If performance is judged to meet minimum standards, the principal should simply check (✓) the practice on the line at the left. No supporting documentation is necessary.

- If performance does not meet minimum standards or is in any way deficient, the principal should put an "I" on the line to the left of the practice(s) in question.

- A teacher who meets minimum standards is a very competent professional teacher (see State bulletin). If a teacher makes a major contribution to a school or consistently exceeds expectations, the principal may make a "C" on the line wherever appropriate and describe the commendatory practice.

HOW TO DOCUMENT DEFICIENCIES.....

- Principals are required to document deficiencies in any section or practice rated as not meeting minimum standards. This is done by checking "I" (improvement suggested) on all deficient practices and recording comments below. Such comments should have two parts: (1) a description of observed deficiencies and (2) suggestion(s) for improvement. The back of the sheet should be used if necessary.

- In making comments on each section, reference must be made to any previous evaluation on file for the teacher being evaluated, and special care must be taken to note the result of any previous suggestions for improvement.

YOU MUST RECOMMEND FOR OR AGAINST EMPLOYMENT.....

- On page four the principal is required to make a recommendation for or against continued employment. He should draw a line through "do" or "do not" or "shall" or "shall not" to leave the wording desired. Note that the principal marks either the first line or the second line, not both.

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS *(Continued)*

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Teacher's Name _____

Date _____

THEN SIGN AND SEND TO AREA OFFICE

- The evaluation form must be signed by the teacher, principal, and vice principal (when involved in the evaluation), then the original must be forwarded to the area office with copies retained by the teacher and principal.

Complete in triplicate:

original for Personnel Services
via Area Office
one copy for teacher
one copy for principal

Legend:

√ = Meets minimum standards
I = Improvement suggested
C = Commendation for consistently exceeding minimum standards

1. PROFESSIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND GROWTH

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Instruction reflects well-planned and effective methodology.

_____ 2. Instruction reflects adequate and current knowledge of subject.

_____ 3. Works to improve professional skills and knowledge.

_____ 4. Bases professional growth program on priority needs identified through cooperative planning with principal or designee.

Comments:

2. PLANNING

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Has plans that can be clearly understood and used.

_____ 2. Can clearly communicate the way any instructional activity relates to the goals of the course of instruction.

_____ 3. Contributes to team planning or other coordinated planning as needed by the teaching assignment.

Comments:

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Teacher's Name _____

Date _____

3. PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING-LEARNING

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Shows respect, consideration, and fairness for students.

_____ 2. Meets needs of students with special interests, abilities, and learning problems.

_____ 3. Gives students personal help and positive reinforcement.

_____ 4. Challenges students to think and to express their thoughts clearly and responsibly.

_____ 5. Helps students set achievement expectations and evaluate their own progress.

_____ 6. Makes it clear to students what they are learning and why.

Comments:

4. ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Helps students achieve self management and control.

_____ 2. Handles classroom incidents and emergencies effectively.

_____ 3. Secures purposeful participation of students.

_____ 4. Makes appropriate referrals of children needing special help.

Comments:

5. LOGISTICS AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Arranges seating and working areas appropriately for the kinds of learning experiences planned (to degree teacher can influence).

_____ 2. Has aesthetically pleasing room (to degree teacher can influence).

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM Teacher's Name _____

Date _____

_____ 3. Keeps room properly lighted, ventilated, and free of hazards to health and safety (to degree teacher can influence).

Comments:

6. USE OF RESOURCES

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Procures, uses and takes proper care of such materials and equipment as are appropriate and available in the school and district.

_____ 2. Uses library, media, students, and personnel of the school and school system as learning resources.

_____ 3. Uses natural and human resources of the community as learning resources.

_____ 4. Uses cultural and business-industrial resources of the community as learning resources.

Comments:

7. EVALUATION

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Maintains and uses cumulative records of student progress in planning instruction.

_____ 2. Uses tests and/or other evaluative information in planning instructional units and after instruction to determine if goals have been met.

_____ 3. Consults principal, specialists, other teachers in the school, and students in evaluating own plans, methods, and results.

_____ 4. Uses instruments and methods that effectively measure the students' attainment of learning goals.

_____ 5. Makes clear to students how success in learning will be judged.

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Teacher's Name _____

Date _____

_____ 6. Communicates effectively with parents and students regarding student achievement, behavior and attendance.

Comments:

8. ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Performance Meets Minimum Standards	Performance Does Not Meet Minimum Standards

_____ 1. Cooperates with and supports other faculty members.

_____ 2. Observes the spirit and intent of rules and regulations of the school and school system.

_____ 3. Provides complete and accurate data to the school, area, and district as requested for management purposes.

_____ 4. Assumes necessary non-instructional responsibilities.

_____ 5. Shares the responsibility with all other employees for promoting the educational goals and developing public acceptance of the school system.

Comments:

9. OTHER:

I (do, do not) recommend this permanent teacher for another year of service in School District No. 1.

If this probationary teacher's work continues to be of its present quality, I (shall, shall not) recommend election for another year of service in School District No. 1.

_____ _____ _____ _____
Principal's Signature Date Vice-Principal's Signature Date

I have read the above report consisting of four pages:

_____ _____
Teacher's Signature Date

Received and Contents Noted

_____
(Area Office)

Date: _____

_____
(District Office Personnel Services)

Date: _____

EX 3 COFFEYVILLE DISTRICT SCHOOLS USD 445 (Kansas)

Teachers' Self-Evaluation
Form 100

Teacher _____ Building _____ Date _____

Self-evaluation is to be considered an integral and important part of the total evaluation program. Prior to formal evaluation conferences teachers are expected to thoughtfully and carefully evaluate themselves on the district's adopted evaluation criteria.

This evaluation is to serve as a portion of the basis for the formal evaluation conference. The principal will go over this form with the teacher; however, it does not become a part of the teacher's file.

	Outstanding 1	Above Average Progress Noted 2	Satisfactory 3	Improvement Needed 4
1. **PROFESSIONAL SKILLS:**				
a. Has adequate knowledge of teaching area (scope and sequence above and below grade level).....				
b. Provides for learning climate through proper attitudes, study habits, discipline; has necessary materials at hand				
c. Has enthusiasm about what he or she is teaching; challenges the interests of the students (provides motivation)				
d. Plans and uses a variety of teaching methods to provide for individual differences so that all children may have successful experiences				
e. Provides opportunities for pupils to learn to think critically and to develop self-discipline.				
f. Enriches classroom experiences through planned use of community resources				
g. Relates content and activities of the course to present day problems and contemporary affairs ..				
h. Employs democratic procedures in the classroom .				
i. Manages the classroom effectively and maintains an atmosphere that is conducive to learning				
j. Maintains an effective working situation and an orderly classroom				
k. Keeps a neat classroom as far as is practicable.				
l. Is attentive to the physical well-being of students in such matters as heating, lighting, ventilation and seating				
m. Is consistent in proper classroom discipline ...				

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (cont.)	Outstanding 1	Above Average Progress Noted 2	Satisfactory 3	Improvement Needed 4
n. Plans satisfactory routine for handling of materials, equipment and supplies				
o. Encourages individual leadership and responsibility				
p. Encourages mutual respect				
q. Encourages independent effort and recognizes that students differ in their abilities to work independently				
2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH:				
a. Participates in in-district professional training, activities, workshops, etc.				
b. Professional growth through college hours, travel, institutes, workshops				
c. Accepts assigned responsibilities				
d. Responds to suggestions for improvement				
e. Specialization (degree to which major field of specialization is complete and is kept up-to-date)				
f. Professional knowledge (understanding of theories of learning and currency of professional knowledge)				
3. INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:				
a. Fosters Mutual Respect with Students, Parents, Staff and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Respects the worth and dignity of others ..				
2. Is honest				
3. Is sensitive to the needs of groups				
4. Has a positive attitude				
5. Demonstrates a genuine interest and concern for individuals				
6. Is consistent				
b. Communicates Effectively in Individual and Group Contacts With Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Demonstrates the ability to get ideas across				

	Outstanding 1	Above Average Progress Noted 2	Satisfactory 3	Improvement Needed 4
INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS (Cont.)				
2. Gives instructions clearly				
3. Is open to ideas and suggestions of others.				
c. Maintains Positive and Reasonable Expectations for Behavior, Achievement, Cooperation, Responsibility as Related to Students, Parents, Staff				
d. Exhibits a Willingness to Go Beyond Normal Expectations in Involvements with Students Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Makes individual contacts				
2. Makes home contacts				
3. Becomes involved with the community				
4. Takes an interest in the activities of other teachers				
5. Takes an interest in all of the student's activities				
e. Involves Students, Parents, Staff, and Community in the Educational Program Where Appropriate: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Participates in curriculum planning				
2. Utilizes community resource persons				
3. Involves volunteers				
4. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:				
a. Maintains Appearance Appropriate to the Occasion in Contacts with Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Exercises care about appearance				
2. Is well-groomed				
3. Dresses appropriately				
4. Practices cleanliness				
b. Voice and Speech Effective in Communicating with Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Speaks clearly in well-modulated voice				
2. Uses voice effectively				

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (Cont.)	Outstanding 1	Above Average Progress Noted 2	Satisfactory 3	Improvement Needed 4
3. Uses correct English in speaking and writing				
4. Voice is appropriate for instructional activity				
c. Attitude Toward Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Displays a pleasant disposition				
2. Smiles				
3. Avoids sarcasm				
4. Has a good sense of humor				
5. Reflects positive, enthusiastic, and imaginative attitude toward teaching				
6. Keeps temper most of the time				
7. Firm, fair, friendly, and enjoys teaching				
8. Displays optimism				
9. Makes constructive contributions				
10. Takes time to listen to others				
d. Habits and Mannerisms with Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Is worthy of being followed as a model by students				
2. Avoids use of slang or foul language				
3. Is open-minded, happy, and tolerant				
4. Is dependable				
e. Emotional Maturity Displayed in Contacts with Students, Parents, Staff, and Community: Suggested indicators of competency:				
1. Demonstrates adequate self-control				
2. Is patient and empathetic with others (understanding)				
3. Uses sound judgment				
4. Responds positively to constructive criticism				
5. Demonstrates tact				
6. Is willing to admit mistakes				

SUPERINTENDENT CONTRACT GUIDELINES

(Prepared by the Assn. of California School Administrators)

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines reject the "model" contract approach. Despite almost universal warnings that "model" contracts must be adapted to individual situations, these warnings are generally ignored. As a result, the contract actually entered into too often falls below its potential value to both the superintendent and the governing board. It is useful, therefore, to set forth a guideline format that includes a discussion of practical and legal considerations involved in negotiating a meaningful contract for both parties.

II. CONTRACT PRINCIPLES

Certain principles are common to meaningful contracts.

A. Specificity.

A good contract reflects the specific agreement between the parties: the board and the superintendent. The more specific the contract is with respect to all provisions, the more useful and meaningful it is.

For example, great care should be exercised to define as precisely as possible the job description of the superintendent, the district goals and objectives during the term of the contract, and an evaluation procedure. Clearly, these three provisions are highly related. The more carefully each of the three is drafted, the more meaningful each becomes in both practical and legal terms. Thus, both parties understand what performance is expected of the superintendent during his term of employment and how that performance is to be measured. It is equally clear that these provisions by necessity must be tailored to the individual needs of the particular parties involved.

B. Modification and Termination.

Many contracts between boards and superintendents are for terms of four years. Obviously, much can happen in that period. One principle that should be considered by both parties is that the contract is subject to modification by mutual agreement at any time. The contract need not then be considered to be "etched in stone" but is rather a potentially dynamic document that can be modified to conform to current needs at any time during its term. In other words, negotiations between the parties may be undertaken at any time during the term of

employment to update or improve the contract.

Termination during the contract term is a subject that is most often best dealt with at the time the parties negotiate the original contract or renewal thereof. Consideration may thus be given to the procedures for termination of employment, such as compensation to be paid, notice to be given, and the effect of evaluation or the lack thereof.

C. Legal Protections.

The board almost invariably has legal counsel approve the contract between it and the superintendent. Too often, however, the superintendent does not enjoy the same benefits and often tends to assume that all necessary legal protections that should be afforded him have indeed been so afforded by the contract proferred by the district and approved by its counsel. This assumption can be a mistaken one.

Consider that the district legal counsel is exactly that. His/her task is to represent the district. He/she cannot and should not be expected to represent both parties to the contract. Depending upon the complexities involved, the superintendent may be well advised to have his/her own counsel participate in the negotiations themselves. At the very least, he/she should have any contract reviewed by his/her counsel prior to executing it.

III. SPECIFIC CONTRACT PROVISIONS

The emphasis here is on an explanation of the implications and potential importance of each of the provisions. The controlling principle in this section is individual selection. In other words, not every provision will be included in every contract. Many of the provisions can be excluded as a result of the negotiation process; others will be excluded because they are not applicable to the individual situation. But, hopefully, each provision will be considered by the superintendent for possible application to his/her situation.

Another caveat: do not suppose that these guidelines cover every possible provision that might be found in a superintendent's contract. Indeed, there may be other provisions which will be of particular importance to you that you will want to specifically include in your own contract.

A. Position Description.

The importance of this provision cannot be overemphasized. The duties and responsibilities of the superintendent should be precisely defined for the benefit of both parties. This is especially important so that the roles of both parties are understood.

The board is in effect the legislative body of the district and as such formulates policy. The superintendent is the chief executive officer and is basically charged with executing the policy. A frequent source

of breakdown of board-superintendent relations is the failure of one party or the other to understand and respect their distinct roles. The superintendent's role should be clearly and precisely defined to reduce possible misunderstanding as much as possible.

The starting point for the superintendent's position description is the Education Code (in California, there are similar codes in other states). But the most important source of additional power and duties may well be the position description itself which may be a part of the contract itself or incorporated by reference.

Each duty of the superintendent should be described with as much specificity as is practicable. For example, the California education code provides that, subject to the approval of the board, the superintendent has the power to assign all certificated employees in the district. This duty can be both expanded and made more specific. Thus, for example, the position description might provide that in all personnel matters, the superintendent shall make a recommendation to the board. Thereafter, the board shall either approve or disapprove the recommendation. If the board disapproves the recommendation, the superintendent shall have a reasonable time to submit another recommendation. Subject to negotiation, the contract might provide that the board at any time could declare an emergency and proceed with the particular action. In any event, a specific procedure is suggested, designed to minimize the problem of confusion of roles. It should be noted that the establishment of such a procedure can be of very significant value to the board when faced with substantial community pressure for immediate action. By virtue of the establishment of the procedure, the board could in effect "buy time" by pointing out that the procedure must be followed prior to the taking of definitive action.

B. Goals and Objectives.

Here again, the parties should spend considerable time defining the goals and objectives of the district at the time the contract is entered into. To the extent possible, these goals and objectives should be reduced to writing and incorporated into the contract. Properly defined goals and objectives coupled with a precise job description will provide a firm basis for evaluation of the superintendent's performance by the board. It is, of course, understood that the goals and objectives be revised annually to conform to the changing needs of the district.

C. Evaluation.

The contract should strive to specifically tailor evaluation procedures to the individual district and superintendent. The observations which follow therefore are directed to the considerations involved in contractual provisions designed to implement evaluation requirements.

Specific evaluation procedures should be agreed upon by the parties. The standards for evaluation should be directly related to the

position description and goals and objectives and should be as objective as practicable.

Agreement should also be reached as to the procedure for the evaluation. Thus, timelines should be established, e.g., during a specific month of each year during the term of employment. Consideration should be given to how the board will mechanically perform the function of evaluation. In this regard, one question would be whether the board members should attempt to arrive at the consensus board evaluation or whether each board member should evaluate the superintendent individually.

The primary purposes of the evaluation are to provide accountability and improved performance. It is therefore important to provide in the contract that the parties meet and discuss the evaluation.

1. Satisfactory evaluation. In the event of a satisfactory evaluation, some superintendents have negotiated contracts that provide for an automatic extension of the term of the contract for a period of one year. The pitfall presented by such a provision is that a board that does not desire such an extension at the time of the evaluation will be motivated to give the superintendent a less than satisfactory evaluation. It is perhaps therefore more desirable not to directly tie the question of extension to evaluation.

2. Unsatisfactory evaluation. In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the contract should provide written specification of the unsatisfactory performance, conference with the board including specific recommendations as to areas of improvement, and follow-up counseling by the board.

Some contracts specifically tie unsatisfactory evaluation to termination of the contract prior to the end of the term, but this provision should be avoided.

3. Lack of evaluation. Suppose the board fails to evaluate as required by the contract. Consider that this failure can have very serious consequences. The superintendent does not know specifically where he/she stands with the board. Moreover, if the board believes his/her performance is unsatisfactory, he/she is effectively denied any opportunity to correct his/her deficiencies. In this instance, his/her contract will obviously not be renewed at the expiration of his/her term, which in fact in itself may seriously damage his/her future professional career.

One possibility is to provide that the consequence of a lack of evaluation is an automatic extension of the contract for a period of one year. Note here that the problem is different than being the automatic extension to a satisfactory evaluation. In other words, the board will retain the discretion to fail to renew the contract by simply evaluating the superintendent, whether the evaluation is satisfactory or not.

D. Termination During the Contract Term.

1. Alleged breach by superintendent. Under some state codes, including California, the board may terminate or rescind the contract during its term if the superintendent has committed a "substantial or material breach" of the contract. It is not possible to provide a meaningful definition of the term "substantial or material breach" because what constitutes such a breach is essentially a question of fact under the particular circumstances and contract involved.

Under existing law, the superintendent with a contract does have a legally enforceable property right by virtue of his/her contract. This means that he/she is entitled to due process of law, including notice and "some kind of hearing" prior to termination.

Since the *Roth* case does not spell out precisely the notice and hearing provisions, it is important to include specific definition of these rights in the contract itself.

The board should thus be required to serve upon the superintendent a reasonably detailed statement of charges which it claims constitute the breach. It should further provide reasonable notice such that an opportunity to meet the charges can be prepared. The right to counsel should be provided.

More difficult questions are presented respecting the hearing itself. For example, should the hearing be held before the board? This question may be crucial because it may well be that the board cannot, under the circumstances, be impartial. Even if the hearing is held before the board, the contract should specify the scope and effect of the hearing. A final decision on the question of whether a substantial or material breach has occurred or whether and to what extent the superintendent is entitled to damages should be left up to a court or other impartial tribunal. Indeed, the superintendent may well conclude that the principal advantage of notice and hearing before the board is to preclude precipitous action by the board. In other words, by the terms of the contract the board would be enjoined from removing the superintendent from his/her position unless and until the procedural requirements of notice and hearing have been met. This requirement in and of itself might be of significant advantage to the superintendent in that it would encourage more deliberate action on the part of the board. In some cases, such deliberation might result in a change of mind on the part of the board or an increased willingness on the part of the board to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

As mentioned above, the questions of existence of substantial breach and damages should not be finally determined by a board hearing. Failing any contrary provision in the contract, any such questions would be determined by way of court action. An alternative to a court action is arbitration. Such a provision is commonly employed in management contracts in the private sector as a means of minimizing the delays and costs frequently encountered in court actions.

2. Termination without breach. Commonly, the board determines, for whatever reason that it desires, to terminate the services of its superintendent under circumstances where a substantial or material breach of contract is questionable or not the real problem involved. Suppose, for example, that the board, through change of composition, has adopted an educational policy diametrically opposed to that in existence when the superintendent was first employed under the contract. The new board may believe that someone other than the present superintendent would be a better person to implement this policy. A superintendent may well decide that he/she would prefer not to work under these circumstances. But, suppose also that he/she cannot find comparable employment immediately.

A provision in the contract might provide that the board at any time by a prescribed vote could terminate (upon reasonable notice) the contract by application of a predetermined formula of compensation for the remaining term of the contract. The advantage to the superintendent of such a provision is elimination of the uncertainties of being placed in an adversary role with the board whether by way of court action or arbitration. Admittedly, this is an unusual provision and would probably not be included in most contracts. It is primarily useful in some districts where frequent changes of board composition and philosophy are commonplace.

E. Attorneys' Fees.

Every contract should have some provision for attorneys' fees. Absent such a provision, each party must assume his/her own attorney's fees. Inasmuch as the board has access to legal services without cost, the superintendent is obviously at a very great disadvantage in the event of controversy. The superintendent should endeavor to bargain to have his/her reasonable attorney's fees paid by the district when it claims a breach and a hearing before the board is required as a precondition to termination. Alternatively, the contract could provide that the prevailing party in any proceeding involving the contract, including court action or arbitration, would be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees.

F. Uniqueness of Position Clause.

The superintendent should also try to include a clause in his/her contract by which the board acknowledges that his/her position is unique and understood to be so by the parties. This provision can add considerable value to the contract. Absent such a provision, any damages awarded to the superintendent because of breach of contract may be limited to the "four corners" of the contract. Thus suppose the district breaches the contract by terminating the superintendent who has three years remaining on the contract at $30,000 per year. His/her maximum damage would be $90,000. However, if the uniqueness of services provision is included in the contract, the superintendent is

then in a position to claim additional (consequential) damages which include damage to his/her career. Thus, for example, if the superintendent could prove that the termination resulted in his/her being unable to obtain comparable employment or advance in his/her career, he/she might be entitled to damages substantially in excess of those set forth in the "four corners" of the contract.

G. Tenure Provision.

The California education code permits the board to grant tenure to any certificated employees in the district. Such a provision may well involve a conflict of interest problem for the superintendent in his/her role as chief executive officer of the governing board. This is so because the superintendent is necessarily involved in negotiations between the board and other certificated employees.

Another common provision is to tie the yearly salary increases to a cost of living increase, such as the Consumer Price Index for the area concerned. Such a provision avoids the conflict of interest problem.

Another alternative is more directly tied to performance than to cost of living. Under this type of provision, a yearly salary review is provided for which usually occurs at the time of the yearly evaluation. This clause is usually coupled with the proviso that the yearly salary cannot in any event be decreased. It can also be coupled with any of the cost of living provisions above discussed such that the yearly salary increase will not in any event be less than that provided for in the cost of living clause.

I. Fringe Benefits.

The conflict of interest problem alluded to above may be extremely difficult to avoid in the area of fringe benefits. Many such benefits are contracted for by the district on a group basis. If the dilemma is unavoidable, the contract might include language to the effect that such benefits will be "at least" those enjoyed by other certificated employees in the district. But, wherever possible, the superintendent should consider bargaining for alternative but commensurate or greater benefits than those enjoyed by other certificated employees.

Certain benefits are commonly provided to superintendents that are not part of group plans. These benefits should be specifically defined. For example, where the district has agreed to provide an automobile, a general description of the automobile, permissible use and insurance coverage should be specified.

J. Vacation.

The number of days of vacation must be specified. The superintendent may also bargain for the option to be paid in lieu of taking the vacation after accrual of a specific number of days. This provision would, of course, be much preferable to simply forfeiting vacation days accumulated in excess of an agreed maximum.

In addition, the contract should specify that upon termination the superintendent will be entitled to be paid for all unused vacation.

K. Sickness and Disability.

This is another area where negotiations may be particularly fruitful. Many boards have increased these benefits for all certificated employees. Many superintendent contracts simply incorporate these benefits, again raising the question of conflict of interest.

Consideration here should be given to negotiating individual benefits. In this regard, the superintendent may consider bargaining for the payment of all or part of the cost of disability and life insurance. Another possible subject of negotiation is a method for determining when the contract should be terminated by reason of the disability of the superintendent. Certainly, if adequate insurance has been provided to cover such an eventuality, the problems inherent in termination by reason of disability can be substantially minimized.

L. Outside Professional Activities.

The agreement should cover the question of outside professional activities such as consulting, speaking and writing for compensation. Prior approval of the board as to any specific engagement should only be required where the superintendent is to be compensated and absence from normal duties is required. This is the type of provision which can avoid potential criticism of the superintendent during the term of the contract.

M. Other Provisions.

Many other provisions may be negotiated as fit the particular circumstances. One example of such a provision is moving expenses. If a superintendent is required to move from one locality to another by accepting employment, the district may agree to assume all or part of the moving expenses. Other provisions are standard, such as the right of the superintendent to be reimbursed for all reasonable and necessary expenses related to employment.